



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## FEBRUARY MEETING, 1904.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 11th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the President in the chair.

The record of the January meeting and the customary monthly reports were read and accepted.

The PRESIDENT announced the death, on January 20th, at Freiburg in Germany, of Hermann Eduard von Holst, a Corresponding Member, and author of a Constitutional History of the United States. He also announced the receipt from Miss Mary Perkins Quincy, of New Haven, Connecticut, of an oak chest, containing numerous beautifully bound "Quincy Papers," embodying the results of much thorough genealogical investigation in England and France. The chest and its entire contents are given to the Society by Miss Quincy as a memorial of her kinsman, Professor Edward E. Salisbury, of New Haven.<sup>1</sup> The President also presented, as a gift from the children of the late Hon. Charles G. Loring (H. C. 1812), the original quitclaim deed, on parchment, of the peninsula of Boston, given in March, 1684-5, by Wampatuck and other Indians to Elisha Cooke and eleven others "for and in the behalfe of themselves and the rest of the Proprietated Inhabitants of y<sup>e</sup> Towne of Boston." This most interesting document was exhibited at the meeting of the Society in March, 1879, and is printed in full in the Proceedings, Vol. XVII. pp. 52-55. A much reduced fac-simile is given in the Memorial History of Boston, Vol. I. p. 250.

Mr. WILLIAM R. THAYER suggested that the By-Laws should be amended by adding that no election to membership shall be valid unless, on due notification, the person elected shall within six months signify in writing his acceptance; and on his motion the subject was referred to the Council as a special committee to report at the next meeting of the Society.

Roger B. Merriman, Ph.D., of Cambridge, was elected a Resident Member.

<sup>1</sup> For an enumeration of the articles given by Miss Quincy, see *post*, p. 250.

The PRESIDENT communicated a letter from Hon. William H. Moody, Secretary of the Navy, in reference to the preservation of the frigate Constitution, and a copy of his reply.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 20, 1904.

DEAR MR. ADAMS,—I received yesterday a report from Rear Admiral Capps, chief constructor of the navy, upon the memorial of the Massachusetts Historical Society, praying that the Constitution be restored and put into commission as a training ship. The following is a copy of the report:

“During a recent visit to the Boston Navy Yard, I took occasion to examine the Constitution, having specially in view the feasibility of refitting that vessel on the lines suggested in the recent memorial addressed to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States by the Council of the Massachusetts Historical Society. While fully in sympathy with the suggestions made by the memorialists, it is considered quite impracticable to refit the Constitution as a training ship, the present condition of the hull of the vessel being such as to necessitate almost entire rebuilding, at very large expense, and when rebuilt it is believed that the vessel would not be suitable as a sea-going training ship for the navy, the man-of-war of the present day being so entirely dissimilar to the Constitution in hull, equipment and ordnance. It is considered that much more satisfactory results would be obtained in keeping the Constitution ‘in ordinary,’ as at present, taking such steps as may be practicable to arrest further deterioration of the hull, and continuing the vessel in her present berth at the navy yard, Boston, this berth being really the most protected one available at that station.

“It is further suggested that the spar deck of the Constitution could be utilized as a naval museum, the chief constructor being informed that there is already at the Boston yard an interesting collection of naval relics belonging to the Naval Library and Institute Society, this society being incorporated under the laws of the State of Massachusetts, and having as its *ex-officio* president the commandant of the station.

“It is believed that such an arrangement, if carried out, would preserve the sentimental associations connected with the Constitution in the most practical manner, and would permit the perpetuation of the historical name Constitution by transferring it to the most formidable type of modern battleship. It is believed that the continuance on the effective navy list of the names of ships which have borne so distinguished a part in our naval history is well worthy of the attention of Congress, and to that end it is recommended that authority be obtained to give the name Constitution to the next first-class battleship authorized to be built.”

In view of this statement, I shall be very glad to receive any further suggestions you may have to make on the subject. In the meantime I will ascertain exactly what has been done by Great Britain in the case of the Victory.

Very truly yours,

W. H. MOODY.

MR. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, 23 Court Street, Boston, Mass.

Boston, Jan. 26, 1904.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY, — Some days since I received your letter of the 20th inst., including the report of Rear Admiral Capps upon the recent memorial of the Massachusetts Historical Society, relating to the frigate Constitution.

I confess to having read the report of Admiral Capps with a not inconsiderable feeling of regret. Enclosed I send you two editorial clippings from recent issues of the Boston Transcript, elicited by it. I do not know who wrote the articles in question, nor were they suggested, or in any way inspired, by me; but they fairly voice my feelings, and, I have reason to believe, the feelings of a large number of others, both in this vicinity and elsewhere.

I must also confess to a feeling of some surprise at the report of Admiral Capps. So far as the present condition of the Constitution is concerned, what he states was already known. The ship can neither be "repaired" nor "refitted." That it had got practically to be rebuilt was well understood. When rebuilt, however, it would still be the Constitution. She was rebuilt in the same way seventy years ago, so that to-day there is in all probability hardly a fragment of the original in the present frigate. It is a well-known physiological fact that every portion of the human body is renewed once in seven years; but, none the less, the individual man retains his identity. In like manner, the hulk now moored in the Charlestown dock is, in an unbroken line, the Constitution, and the traditions and memories of the original ship linger about it.

Admiral Capps refers to the "very large expense" involved in rebuilding. As compared with the national outgo of the present time, would this expense be sufficient to merit consideration? At the most, it could not well exceed half a million dollars; and I am confident I speak for a very large number of the American community, if not for the whole of it, when I submit that, in the case of a nation expending what the United States is now annually expending, the appropriation for this purpose of an amount such as that named cannot, in view of the sentiment involved, and the moral results flowing therefrom, be deemed excessive or wasteful. It would amount, after all, only to the average national outgo of each six hours of every day that passes. So

viewed I do not believe an individual could anywhere be found who would raise his voice in objection to it.

I am also somewhat surprised at the statement in the report of Admiral Capps that the Constitution "would not be suitable as a sea-going training ship for the navy." The late Admiral Sampson certainly expressed himself to a very different effect; and the Constellation, a frigate of the same period as the Constitution, is at this very time in commission and stationed at Newport. A photograph of her, recently taken, is now before me. It is true that the Constitution is not, and cannot be made into, an ironclad; neither can it be navigated by steam. Nevertheless, I had supposed that the handling of a sailing ship of the old style was a distinct and important part of the training of every modern naval officer; and, moreover, I am under the impression that a vessel called the Chesapeake — a name, by the way, inseparably associated in our naval annals with humiliation and defeat — now serves that academic purpose in connection with the school at Annapolis. Might the Chesapeake not well be replaced in such service by the Constitution — the "Ironsides" of our earliest navy?

Finally, the proposal that the name Constitution should be transferred from the frigate to a modern battleship does not commend itself to my judgment. It is, on the contrary, distinctly distasteful. That name belongs to that ship, and to that ship only. In the memory of the American people it was, and should remain, always associated with that ship and with no other. That it should now be transferred to a vessel of wholly different type, with no record and no associations, would be otherwise than gratifying.

Permit me in closing to add that one hope the memorialists of the Massachusetts Historical Society had entertained was that the Constitution, as representing the first navy of the United States, might, followed by the Hartford, representing the second navy of the United States, lead the naval procession which, it is believed, will at no remote day commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal. That event, it may reasonably be anticipated, will not be deferred beyond the year 1912. Were the necessary appropriation for rebuilding and refitting the Constitution now made, that ship, like the Hartford, would, when the proper time came, be in condition to take her appropriate place in the van of what will always hereafter be remembered as one of the memorable American historic displays. That is where she would properly belong; nor would the people of the United States account the spending of the sum necessary to put her there a waste of the public moneys.

I note what you say in regard to the measures you have taken "to ascertain exactly what has been done by Great Britain in the case of the Victory." I would call your attention to the fact that the Victory is an old-fashioned line-of-battle ship, and accordingly quite unfit for

the academic purposes to which the Chesapeake now is, or the Constitution might be, devoted. The hope was that the Constitution might be kept afloat and in commission; and, even though the old hulk should be preserved, it would not be without regret that those who appreciate what the Constitution once did for us would see her spar deck utilized hereafter merely as a naval museum.

I would, therefore, on behalf of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and other memorialists, express an earnest hope that the wishes they have expressed in this respect—wishes which they have reason to know are shared by other citizens in every section of the common country—may yet receive a favorable consideration.

I have the honor to be, etc.,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM H. MOODY, Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CHARLES E. NORTON, from the Committee appointed at the November meeting to represent the Society in the matter of a memorial or memorials to John Adams and John Quincy Adams, in compliance with the invitation of the State House Commission, made an oral report that the Committee had attended to that duty, and asked to be discharged, which was accordingly done. In a letter to the chairman of the Commission, which has been placed on file, the Committee expressed the opinion that the best form of memorial would be two seated portrait figures in marble, to be placed in two of the four niches in the Memorial Hall in the State House.

Mr. FRANKLIN B. SANBORN read parts of a biographical sketch of Rev. Samuel Langdon, D.D., President of Harvard College from 1774 to 1780.

*Samuel Langdon, S.T.D., Scholar, Patriot, and President of  
Harvard University.*

I mention Dr. Langdon's titles to recollection in the order in which the world in general esteems them, but also as they led to his advancement from obscurity to public notice, and thence to eminence in the eighteenth century. It was his scholarship which gave him rank when young, and led to his establishment as a clergyman in a large and wealthy parish at the age of four and twenty. This position brought him into close relations with public affairs, but had been preceded by the first distinct act of patriotism,—his taking part in the provin-

cial capture of Louisbourg in 1745, under Sir William Pepperrell, when Langdon was but two and twenty. Doubtless his serving as chaplain to one of the regiments — that raised in New Hampshire — which accomplished that daring enterprise was a step towards his succeeding to the pastorate of Rev. Mr. Fitch in Portsmouth. This pastorate made him cognizant of the patriotic opinions and plans of Langdon, Sullivan, and the other opponents of British aggression in New Hampshire; and he joined in them so cordially that, when the Corporation and Overseers of Harvard College in 1774, whose members were chiefly of the party of the Adamses and Hancock, had to choose a new President, they naturally invited Dr. Langdon of Portsmouth to that difficult place, in which he served during the six most critical years of the Revolution.

Samuel Langdon was the son of Samuel, a housewright or carpenter of Boston, and Esther Osgood, his wife, and was born, January 12, 1723, in the North End of Boston, probably in Cross Street. He was the youngest of six children, and took the name of his eldest brother, Samuel, who had died at the age of eight, in October, 1721. He was the grandson of Philip Langdon, a mariner, and his wife Mary; and this Philip was probably the son of a John Langdon, who may have been a brother of Tobias Langdon, ancestor of the distinguished brothers John and Woodbury Langdon, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The Langdons appear to have come from Devonshire. Samuel, the future divine, had an uncle, Paul Langdon, who removed to Wilbraham and had numerous descendants; he was himself the second cousin of Elizabeth Langdon of Boston, two years older than himself (born in 1721), who became the wife of Rev. Andrew Eliot of the North Church, Boston, at whose advice, as a member of the Corporation of Harvard, Dr. Langdon, early in October, 1774, became President of the embarrassed College. Dr. Langdon married, in 1748, Elizabeth Brown, daughter of the deceased minister of Reading, Rev. Richard Brown, a scholar of some note in his day. Five children of this marriage lived to maturity, all but two of whom left descendants; so that the posterity of Dr. Langdon, by his own name and other names, are now numerous, and reside in many parts of the United States, in Georgia, North Carolina, and California, as well as in New York. I may add that Nathaniel Langdon, a Boston innkeeper in the first half

of the eighteenth century, was a first cousin of Mrs. Andrew Eliot, and a second cousin of Dr. Langdon; he was the grandfather and namesake of Rev. Nathaniel Langdon Frothingham, a former member of this Society.

I mention these genealogical details because Rev. John Eliot, who was rather too fond of disparaging his mother's cousin, President Langdon, speaks of him in his Biographical Dictionary as of humble origin, "of parents poor but respectable." So he was, being a carpenter's son; but he was not the only person in history so designated; and Boston mechanics were the fathers of many of the Fathers of the Revolution, beginning with the eldest and most illustrious, Benjamin Franklin. Illustrious descent, in America, has little on which to found its pretensions, until we get back into the twilight of European heraldry. Owen O'Sullivan, a grandson of four Irish Countesses, as he was told, but who ran away from the peerage, and changed his name to John Sullivan and his station to that of schoolmaster along the Pascataqua, has been made more famous by his two sons, John and James, who became respectively Governors of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, than by his descent from the kings of Kerry. In his old age, writing to his son the New Hampshire General, old Owen quoted a rather lame Latin quatrain thus, in disdain of genealogy: —

*Si Adam sit Pater cunctorum, Mater et Eva,  
Cur non sunt homines nobilitate pares?  
Non pater aut mater dant nobis nobilitatem,  
Moribus et vita nobilitatur homo.*

Which elegiac verse I render,

*Was Adam all men's sire, and Eve their mother?  
Then how can one be nobler than another?  
Ennobled are we not by sire or dame,  
Till life and conduct give us noble fame.*

Dr. Langdon answered to this requirement so well that he furnished his own title to renown.

The lad very early showed indications of his tendency towards the life of a scholar, and these were so marked that friends promoted his wish for a liberal education, and he entered Harvard College at the age of thirteen, in 1736. There he became one of the beneficiaries under the liberal donations



of Thomas Hollis to promote religious education in New England. Quincy, in his *History of Harvard University*, in a passage rather more grandiloquent than his wont, says near the beginning of the twelfth chapter:—

“In the literary horizon of Harvard the name of Hollis is applicable, not to a single star, but to a constellation. Six individuals bearing it are entitled to rank high in the list of its benefactors. Of these the first and greatest was Thomas Hollis, who was born in 1659 and died in 1731. Three of the six bore this name of Thomas; the others respectively of John, Nathaniel, and Timothy. The second Thomas was the son of Nathaniel, and heir of his uncle, the first Thomas. The third Thomas was the son of the second. Timothy was the son of John.”

One of the first official acts of Dr. Langdon after he became President of the College in October, 1774, was to write to one of the latest of the six stars in Quincy's constellation (Timothy Hollis), condoling with him on the death of the second Thomas; and I quote it for its pathetic touch in regard to the education of the poor scholar then at the head of the College. Dr. Langdon said,—

“The name of HOLLIS claims the highest veneration and an everlasting remembrance in this seat of Science. In its weak beginnings it was enriched and adorned by the great Benefactor of this name, with a fund for two most important Professorships, and a very considerable provision for ten students to be trained up for the Evangelical ministry; besides other very valuable donations. Among many others, the writer of this rejoices in having been one of the children educated by the bounty of so generous a patron.”

Graduating in 1740, and taking his master's degree in 1743, young Langdon became a teacher in the flourishing town of Portsmouth, then the capital of the fast-growing Province of New Hampshire, under the government of the powerful and liberal family of Wentworth, who continued to rule it for a whole generation longer. Langdon was a favorite there, was asked to assist the aged pastor of the oldest church in 1744, then went as chaplain to the siege of Louisbourg, as already mentioned, and in 1747 succeeded Mr. Fitch in the parish, and became one of the chaplains of the Provincial Legislature meeting at Portsmouth. He received a grant of mountain

lands near Conway for his service in the war, married in 1748, and built a capacious house for his bride in 1749, which is still owned by his descendants, and in which I spent an agreeable half-hour lately, with Dr. Langdon's great-granddaughter, Mrs. Mary Pickering Harris, who represents in Portsmouth the three intermarried families of Pickering, Goddard, and Langdon. I found her grieved at the unfair way, as she thinks, in which President Quincy treated the character and administration of *her* ancestor and *his* distinguished predecessor; and I am inclined to agree with her in that opinion. Still more unfair is the account of President Langdon's resignation which this Historical Society has published in the third part of the Belknap Papers, from the gossiping pen of Rev. John Eliot, who gives a very incorrect view of Dr. Langdon's letter of resignation. As this letter has never been published, I think, nor its exact dates set forth in connection with the action of the Corporation over which he had presided, I will give it. The order of events was extraordinary, and his resolution to resign suddenly formed. On the 28th of August, 1780, he had presided at a meeting of the Corporation, and entered their brief proceedings in the record-book with his own hand, in that clear and beautiful penmanship which his diploma to General Washington, four years earlier, had exhibited. Two days before he was waited on by an impudent committee of a dozen students, who invited him to resign, in an insulting paper which had previously been read to one of the faculty, presumably the librarian, Winthrop, who encouraged them in their insubordination. On the 30th of August the President sent to his colleagues of the Corporation, addressing them in very respectful terms, this dignified letter, which Eliot has misrepresented:—

GENTLEMEN, — Upon your invitation, when the flames of war were just breaking out, in the most difficult and critical situation of affairs, both of the State and of the College, notwithstanding every discouraging prospect, I took my leave of a Church with which I was connected by every obligation and endearment, and ventured into the midst of tumult and dangers; that I might contribute whatever was in my power for the support of Liberty and Literature. Sensible of the weight of duty which would come upon me, I wished for greater abilities both of Body and Mind, to go thro' the various and important services then in my view.

Soon after my acceptance and removal to Cambridge, I found myself surrounded by the din of arms, called to complicated labors, almost beyond my strength, and obliged to remove my family and effects from town to town, before I could have a safe and quiet residence in Cambridge.<sup>1</sup> After which numerous difficulties occurred from year to year, in the affairs of this literary Society, which required increased application beyond all the ordinary duties of the President's office. By Divine help I have been supported to the present time, tho' subject to many mental and bodily infirmities; and my chief satisfaction is the hope that my zealous endeavors to serve the noble cause of my Country and Liberty, and the important interests of Religion and Literature, have not been wholly without good effects.

But old age is advancing on a constitution which in former years was much weakened by threatening nervous disorders; and the course of severe labor which I have gone through, since I entered on the duties of my office, has hastened on the common decays of nature. My memory greatly fails; that spirit and vigor necessary for the happy management of an University are sensibly abated; my taste for youthful studies is decreasing; a life so public grows less agreeable, and the show and ceremony of the world begin to be a burden. I therefore rather wish for a more retired situation.

These considerations have led me to a determination to resign that office with which, by your favor, I have been honored. And I now beg to declare my resignation of the President's Chair in Harvard College; trusting that the God of all wisdom may soon direct you to the choice of some worthy Gentleman, who will fill the vacancy with greater dignity, and, with more distinguishing abilities and success, go through the various duties of the office.

Permit me nevertheless to request the favor that my family may continue in the house appropriated to the President's use, until my own at Portsmouth can be prepared for their reception; and that, considering the heavy expense of my removing, after serving the College in times of peculiar difficulty, without receiving more than one third of the emoluments of the office, which in better times were enjoyed (if compared with current expenses), you would afford me all that kind assistance which may be in your power.

For all the honor you have done me, and the constant candor and goodness with which you have treated me, I entertain the warmest sentiments of gratitude. It is my fervent prayer that the Father of Lights would grant every blessing to the literary Society which has been committed to my care; and that it may be celebrated through the world

<sup>1</sup> Referring to the removal of the President first to Watertown, then to Concord, after the battle of Bunker Hill, when the College was broken up temporarily, and afterward reassembled in the Concord meeting-house.

for retaining the truth of the Gospel, for the purest morals, and the most perfect cultivation of every branch of Science.

With the highest Friendship and Esteem, I am, Gentlemen, your most obliged and humble Servant,

SAMUEL LANGDON.

HARVARD COLLEGE, August 30, 1780.

I hardly see how a president, under the unpleasant circumstances of the case, could write a more gentle and Christian epistle. "A wounded spirit who can bear?" and that pain which the generous must feel at being ungenerously dealt with is manifest in every paragraph of this document. But there is nothing in it to warrant Eliot in quoting the good Doctor as saying, "My taste for *academical* studies decreases; my fondness for show and public notice is lost, and I wish heartily to retire." The meaning of the polite President was very different from this travesty. So much had his memory failed that he could not remember injuries.

Rev. John Eliot, whose sister married Dr. Belknap, the founder of our Historical Society, was an amusing writer, but not in youth a very impartial or religious man if we may judge by his published letters. A gallery of portraits sketched by him, as drawn from his letters to Belknap, would show the New England worthies of his youthful day in a very strange light. He was young, fluent, critical, and put no restraint on his ready pen. Dr. Byles in his eyes was a "silly, impertinent, childish person,—one consistent lump of absurdity." Paul Revere found no more favor in his sight; Samuel Adams "loves me [the great John Eliot] as the devil does righteousness." Winchester, a very respectable divine, who afterwards founded the Finsbury Square Chapel in London, was "a New Light haranguer," wishing to "pull down the standing clergy." Of the College Presidents in 1780, Eliot writes: "What a group, *mirabile pecus!* president Langdon, *Cambridge*, Stiles, *Yale*, Wheelock, *Dartmouth*, Graham, *Fishkill*,—I beg Mr. Manning's pardon, who resides at Providence." Dr. Mather's pamphlet in 1782 "partook of the *rabies* of the family; was weak, quaint, pettish, with the pomposity of his father." Dr. Dwight, afterwards President of Yale, "is a complete bigot, on the plan of his grandfather, Jonathan Edwards; has studied little else in divinity but that scheme." Rev. William Hazlitt, father of the essayist, "is the most conceited and imprudent

man I ever met with." These may serve as samples of his discernment and freedom of speech. He had reached the mature age of twenty years and six months when he thus passed judgment upon Dr. Langdon, whom his father had successfully urged to leave his attached parishioners and come to his thorny path at Cambridge:—

"President Langdon now sits in the academical chair. To give you my opinion of this gentleman *sub rosa*, I think him a *compages* of good sense, much learning, more arrogance, and no less conceit. His first setting out was beginning his expositions on Romans, detaining us an hour and half in the Chapel to hear them. The next was, abolishing Sunday evening singing, to give more time for his harangue. I expect the next will be ordering the Bachelors to dispute, which will soon bring him and us by the ears."

A few months later this Daniel come to judgment wrote, more hopefully: "I hope our Præses will be a useful man. He is rather more popular than he was."

Now, what had Dr. Langdon been doing that entitled him to be chosen from outside the Province, of which Harvard College was then a dependency, to the chair of that "seminary," as it was once the fashion to call it? He was probably in 1774, at the age of fifty-one, in most branches of knowledge the most learned and exact scholar of all New England. He had been eminent in college and a successful teacher, had cultivated mathematics and geography, astronomy and history, and collected a valuable library, some part of which helped on my youthful studies in the town where he died, Hampton Falls. Like all the residents of New Hampshire, the province most immediately threatened in the French and Indian wars, he had made himself active to repel, and finally to conquer, the Canadian French and their Indian allies; and when the war of 1754-63 came on, he busied himself, along with Colonel Blanchard, an officer in that war, to provide England and America with a better map than was attainable of the region in dispute, northwestern New Hampshire and Vermont. This map was first prepared in 1756, but not published in London till 1761, when it appeared on a large sheet dedicated to Charles Townshend, then one of the English cabinet. So pleased was he with the work and the inscription,—stimulated, perhaps, by the recommendation of Governor Went-

worth, of Portsmouth,—that he procured for Mr. Langdon the honorary degree of S.T.D. from the University of Aberdeen. During the same war Langdon was in correspondence with the New Hampshire commanders, as is shown, among other evidence, by the long letter of Captain Nathaniel Folsom, afterwards a Revolutionary general, addressed to Mr. Langdon, and now among this Society's manuscripts. I may note in passing that Bancroft, the historian, has made a mistake in describing the spirited engagement reported in this letter, which he might have avoided had he read Dr. Langdon's sermon of 1759 on the capture of Quebec. Bancroft says: "A party of 300 French who had rallied and were retreating in a body, at two miles from Lake George were attacked by Macginnis of *New Hampshire*, who, with 200 men of that Colony, was marching across the portage from Fort Edward." Dr. Langdon says, basing his statement on the letter of Folsom, who speaks very slightly of McGennis, a *New York* captain:—

"At their place of rendezvous the French were met by a small scout of 140 men, of the New Hampshire and New York regiments, under the captains Folsom and McGennis, who, hastening from Fort Edward toward the lake at the report of cannon, discovered and engaged the enemy, as they were reassembling where they had left their baggage; fought from 4 p. m. till night, killed about 100, dispersed the body, and then proceeded to the Camp with the loss of only six of their number killed. This was on Sept. 8, 1755."

The war successfully ended, and young King George seated on the throne, Dr. Langdon joined with the other clergymen of New Hampshire and eastern Maine in congratulating him on his accession. The great-uncle of John Adams, Rev. Joseph Adams of Newington, then seventy-three years old, presided at the synod, but the address bears plain marks of Dr. Langdon's style, and is signed by him, along with Mr. Gookin of North Hampton and Dr. Haven of Portsmouth. It said:—

"We cannot but recollect with the greatest pleasure how securely we enjoyed our Civil and Religious Liberties during the reign of your Majesty's Royal Grandfather, by whose Wisdom and Moderation the authority of the Laws was supported, and Protestants of all denominations countenanced and protected from the furious insults of Party

Zeal. Especially these American Colonies must forever remember his paternal care, who, at a very critical time of most threatening danger, defended us by his Arms; which, accompanied with most signal smiles of Divine Providence, have delivered us from the Massacre of the barbarous Salvages, to which our Frontiers were continually exposed,—the fears of Romish superstition and the chains of France.

“While we are laboring according to the peculiar duties of our sacred character to promote among our people the Religion of Jesus Christ, our Divine Master, agreeable to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel, we shall ever be careful to inculcate upon them principles of loyalty and subjection to your Majesty’s government, and enforce these duties by our own example.”

This was in 1761; nor was Dr. Langdon’s Election sermon of May, 1775, so inconsistent with this expression of loyalty as might appear at first sight. He made a distinction between the king and his ministers and their purchased parliament, which distinction, if the king had fully understood and acted on, he might have retained the allegiance of the Colonies.

I find in the archives of Harvard College a curious evidence of Dr. Langdon’s universal studies, in the following letter to the mathematical professor at Cambridge, John Winthrop, dated Portsmouth, September 15, 1769, and enclosing some astronomical calculations:—

“I have presumed to trouble you with such observations as I have been able to make on several places of the present Comet; which perhaps may afford you some little advantage, in supplying some vacancies in the observations at Cambridge; as I am ready to suppose your state of health may have hindered you from tracing it in so many points of the horizon as might be desired. I wish I could have more seasonably procured a good instrument; but I think the three last places were taken with as much accuracy as I was capable of using. Only, since the motion in 24 hours was about four degrees, and such observations took up some minutes of time, perhaps there may be three or four minutes of a degree allowed for the Comet’s change of place, while I was taking its distance from several stars. Pray excuse the mixture of my rude guesses, which are founded only upon a mental view of the path which appearances led me to think the Comet must take, and the course of its way on the celestial globe.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This very globe was left by Dr. Langdon, with his learned wig and other articles, to one of his Hampton Falls deacons, Jeremiah Lane, and afforded me the first sight of such an instrument when I was perhaps seven years old.

Three years earlier Dr. Langdon, together with Dr. Haven of Portsmouth, Rev. Mr. Stevens of Kittery, and Rev. Mr. McClintock of Greenland, had examined and approved young Mr. Belknap as a candidate for the ministry; and Dr. Langdon was the "scribe" of the church council which directed the proceedings at the ordination of Mr. Belknap at Dover in February, 1767. Thus was New Hampshire provided with her best historian, in whose labors Dr. Langdon co-operated. His second son, Paul Langdon, graduated at Harvard in 1770, and the Doctor himself had favored the admission of several students from New Hampshire to that College during his Portsmouth residence, and even after the opening of Dartmouth College. Under these circumstances, when in 1774, by the sudden retirement of President Locke, the chair at Harvard became vacant, and the difficult position was made more difficult by the political controversies of the period, Dr. Langdon's clerical and political friends in Boston turned toward him as a suitable man for the presidency, which several of them had declined. Dr. Andrew Eliot, father of the young critic John, seems to have been the member of the College Corporation selected to remove Dr. Langdon's scruples about leaving his church and congregation and putting himself in the path of the British lion, then represented in Boston and Cambridge by General Gage, who had succeeded Hutchinson as Governor of Massachusetts, with a Tory band of mandamus Councillors around him. Some of these were naturally averse to the appointment of so pronounced a patriot as Dr. Langdon, and it was feared they would raise difficulties. Dr. Eliot visited his friend at Portsmouth soon after he and his associates had secretly chosen Langdon, in July, 1774; and not long after his visit Dr. Langdon wrote to Dr. Eliot thus: —

PORTSMOUTH, August 10, 1774.

REV'D AND DEAR SIR,—The Church and Congregation, the day you left us, voted to leave the important affair of my Call to the determination of my own best judgment. I know not what to do; may God give me counsel. Perhaps providence may soon present some circumstances which may fix my mind. Pray favour me with your friendly advice and assistance.

Your Brother in the Gospel,

SAM<sup>L</sup> LANGDON.



On the same sheet which contains this note in the archives of this Society, is the first draft of a reply by Dr. Eliot, who said:—

“Yours of 10th inst. I received. I am glad there is like to be no difficulty with your people. I sincerely hope there will be no difficulty anywhere else. Dr. Appleton informs, you have tho'ts of giving your answer soon. When the Overseers adjourned to Oct. it was supposed that you would be not likely to give your answer before that time. It hath been usual to read the Pres't's answer at that board, who have then voted to desire him to remove, &c. It is my opinion that, provided you [*illegible*] and I trust you will, it will be on all accounts best to defer it a few weeks. In this opinion Dr. Appleton, Dr. Pemberton, Dr. Winthrop & Dr. Cooper agree with me. Dr. Cooper would have written his sentiments if you had not been absent. You will soon hear from him.”

It would appear from another letter of Dr. Eliot's that one of the Governor's Council had threatened some opposition; at any rate, the affair dragged on, and on the 30th of August, 1774, just six years before he wrote his letter of resignation, Dr. Langdon wrote again to his friend, saying:—

I understand, by a letter from Dr. Haven's son to his father, that you are under apprehensions of a difficulty on account of the Governor and new Council's concern in the installment, if I should speedily answer the Call of the College, in the affirmative. I see no prospect of the removal of that difficulty in any short time; a twelvemonth will hardly be sufficient to settle things, if all should at length turn in our favor at home.<sup>1</sup> If therefore the formalities of Installment are necessary, so long a delay of my answer would be in many respects inconvenient; for my people already grow impatient for the final decision, and are ready to recall the liberty already given me. My aim is to serve the College if I am able. I am willing for my own part to forego anything which may be considered merely as a point of honor, and risque a maintenance on the credit of the College and Province. If there are embarrassments which cannot be surmounted, in any reasonable time, I shall think it my duty to refuse the honor offered me. All I desire is to know what I ought to do. I have written to Dr. Winthrop for his opinion. Pray favor me with yours as soon as possible. The momentous affair must very soon be determined.

Your affectionate Friend and Brother, etc.

SAM<sup>L</sup> LANGDON.

1 “At home” meant England.

Of course the members of the Corporation wrote him at once that he must not decline (as they had done), and early in October, 1774, he became President. His doing so is thus seen to have been a favor to the College, then in serious straits for a good president, rather than a favor to the pastor of an attached congregation. His remark about risking "a maintenance on the credit of the College and Province," recalls the wellnigh forgotten fact that Harvard was then dependent, in part, on the Provincial Legislature for its pecuniary support,—the rent of Massachusetts Hall, then £60 a year, being appropriated by the General Court for the President's salary,—to which were added certain fees. As the Revolutionary paper money decreased in value, the salary of Dr. Langdon fell to less than half what had been stipulated at first (£200 in silver), and the deficiency was in part made up to him by the Legislature after his resignation.

Nor was this the only source of financial trouble to the President and College. Dr. Langdon had been chosen on the 18th of July at the house of John Hancock on Beacon Hill, and with the active support of Hancock, then one of the richest and most popular merchants in Boston. He was also College Treasurer since 1773, having made good to the College a defeated bequest of the uncle, Thomas Hancock, from whom his wealth was inherited; and having been chosen into the College Corporation in view of the facts just stated. Dr. Langdon's active duties began October 14, and in November it was his duty to write to his friend Colonel Hancock, requesting him to make the first annual settlement of his accounts as Treasurer, and inform his colleagues of the state of the College funds. No notice was taken of this letter, and a second and third letter, January 27, 1775, and March 7 following, produced no other effect than a promise, which Hancock never kept, to make the financial statement desired. Letter followed letter, and just before the fight at Lexington and Concord the Corporation voted, —

"That Colonel Hancock be requested to deliver the moneys, bonds, and other papers belonging to the College Treasury, into the hands of the President, Dr. Appleton, Dr. Winthrop, and Dr. Eliot, or any two of them, a committee for that purpose; and that they give him a proper receipt, which shall be his discharge for the same."

This polite way of turning out a treasurer not only did not produce the moneys, but angered the busy and popular Hancock, then active in the measures that soon brought on war. He wrote from the Provincial Congress at Concord (sitting in the meeting-house where a few months after Dr. Langdon was expounding Romans or Revelations and hearing College recitations), a tart letter in which he declared, —

“That he has at heart the interest of the College as much as any one, and will pursue it. He is much surprised at the contents of the President’s letter, as well as at the doings of the gentlemen present, which he very seriously resents. . . . Peradventure his absence [at Philadelphia, whither he was soon going to the Continental Congress] *may not be longer than a voyage to Machias.*”

We know not what this last Parthian arrow signifies, nor where it hit, but it must have been aimed at some member of the Corporation. The battle of Concord came on, the Congress met, Hancock became its president, and signed the Declaration of Independence fifteen months after, all the while neglecting his duty as College Treasurer. Two years later Hancock was displaced, and Storer made Treasurer.

Events were occurring which made the ire of Colonel Hancock seem trifling, as his conduct certainly was. The Colony began to arm for the inevitable struggle with the mother-country; General Gage and Earl Percy found out on the 19th of April, six months after Dr. Langdon’s taking the academic chair, what sort of marksmen the despised militia of Middlesex and Essex were; the Provincial Congress at Watertown took charge of the government of the Province, and on the annual Election Day, May 31, 1775, the new President of Harvard was installed as preacher of the Election sermon. His pamphlet is before me. His subject was, “Government corrupted by Vice”; his text, from the radical prophet Isaiah, “I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning; afterward thou shalt be called the City of Righteousness, the Faithful City.” This was aimed at the Tory justices and the mandamus Councillors, whose Whig successors were soon to be found sitting in their vacated places; but the preacher did not stop at their feeble transgressions: he struck at the source of their misgovernment—the tyranny and corruption of the English administration—in these well-chosen words:—

“ We have lived to see the time when British liberty is just ready to expire; when that constitution of government which has so long been the glory and strength of the English nation, is deeply undermined and ready to tumble into ruins: — when America is threatened with cruel oppression, and the arm of power is stretched out against New England, and especially against this Colony; to compel us to submit to the arbitrary acts of legislators who are not our representatives, and who will not themselves bear the least part of the burdens which, without mercy, they are laying upon us . . . We are no longer permitted to fix our eyes on the faithful of the land, and trust in the wisdom of their counsels and the equity of their judgment. But men in whom we can have no confidence, — whose principles are subversive of our liberties, whose aim is to exercise lordship over us, and share among themselves the public wealth, — men who are ready to serve any master, and execute the most unrighteous decrees for high wages, — whose faces we never saw before, and whose interests and connections may be far divided from us by the wide Atlantic, — are to be set over us as counsellors and judges; at the pleasure of those who have the riches and power of the nation in their hands, and whose noblest plan is to subjugate the Colonies first, and then the whole nation, to their will.”

In this bold outburst Langdon was but echoing what Burke and Chatham were saying in England, and denouncing influences against which Fox and Rockingham long strove in vain after the death of Chatham, — that great statesman whom Langdon in New Hampshire, with his friends the Wentworths and Atkinsons, had loyally supported in the dark days of the French war.

Soon after this sermon the College was removed to Concord, concerning which more will be said presently. It returned to Cambridge in the summer of 1776, and the degree of LL.D. was conferred on General Washington there. Two years afterward, Dr. Locke, Dr. Langdon's predecessor, died. I found the other day, at the Public Library, among the manuscripts, this eulogy of him, in Dr. Langdon's handwriting, perhaps designed for his tombstone: —

#### IN MEMORY OF THE REV. SAMUEL LOCKE, D.D.

As a divine he was learned and judicious. In the pastoral office vigilant and faithful. As a Christian devout and charitable. In his friendships firm and sincere. Humane, affable and benevolent in his

disposition. In the conjugal and parental relations kind and *officious*.<sup>1</sup> The uncommon size and penetration of his genius, the extensiveness of his erudition, that fund of useful knowledge which he had acquired ; the firmness and mildness of his temper and manners, his easiness of access and patient attention to others, joined with his singular talents for government, procured him universal esteem, — especially of the governors and students of Harvard College, over which he presided for four years with much reputation to himself and advantage to the public. Afterwards he retired to the private walks of life, entertaining and improving the more confined circle of his friends, until his death, which was very sudden, on the 15th of January, 1778, aged 45.

I believe this the longest account of that brief President we have anywhere. It speaks well for the heart of his successor, and indicates what were the qualities Dr. Langdon admired, nearly all of which he possessed. We may smile at the adjectives and nouns he now and then employs, as we do at the panegyrics and invective of others ; but it is true of this good Doctor that he preferred to praise rather than to blame.

The town of Concord, when Dr. Langdon and his hundred students removed thither in September, 1775, was rather smaller than Cambridge, with a large meeting-house, where the Provincial Congress had lately assembled, two or three taverns, a court-house, a wooden jail, in which the next year Sir Archibald Campbell was imprisoned, a few good houses in the village, and many large farmhouses on its outskirts and in the four quarters of the great township. The Old Manse was newly built, and occupied by Rev. William Emerson (grandfather of Waldo Emerson), whose mother-in-law, the widow of Parson Bliss, his predecessor in the pulpit, occupied with her family the oldest house in the village, still standing on the main street ; and upon its book-shelves that part of the College library which had been brought over from Andover was probably arranged for the use of professors and students, and of the town minister, Mr. Emerson, who, by special vote of the Corporation, was allowed to consult the books. A short mile to the westward, on the large farm of

<sup>1</sup> Here Dr. Langdon used the last adjective as did his contemporary Dr. Johnson, in his poem on his companion Levet : —

Well tried through many a varying year  
See Levet to the grave descend ;  
*Officious*, innocent, sincere,  
Of every friendless name the friend.

the Tory Lee, which had once belonged to Major Willard, the companion of Rev. Peter Bulkeley, stood the largest house in Concord (burned forty years ago), in which many of the students lived. Others were distributed through the town, some of them still farther to the northwestward, on the roads to Annursnac and Strawberry Hill. The recitations were given in the meeting-house, the court-house, and at the Lee house by Nashawtuc. Dr. Langdon himself lived at Dr. Minott's, where afterward the Middlesex Hotel stood, and the professors in places not far off. Before leaving the town to return to Cambridge, Dr. Langdon, representing the Faculty, thus addressed the Selectmen, "the gentlemen of the committee, and other gentlemen and inhabitants who have favored the College with their encouragement and assistance": —

*Gentlemen,* — The assistance you have afforded us in obtaining accommodations for this Society here (when Cambridge was filled with the glorious army of freemen which was assembled to hazard their lives in their country's cause, and our removal from thence became necessary), demands our grateful acknowledgments. We have observed with pleasure the many tokens of your friendship to the College; and particularly thank you for the use of your public buildings. We hope the scholars, while here, have not dishonored themselves and the Society by any incivilities or indecencies of behavior, — or that you will readily forgive any errors which may be attributed to the inadvertence of youth.

May God reward you with all His blessings, grant us a quiet resettlement in our ancient seat, to which we are now returning, preserve America from slavery, and establish and continue Religion, Learning, Liberty, Peace, and the happiest Government in these American Colonies, to the end of the world!

In addition to this vote of thanks, the College voted £10 to the Selectmen for the use of the meeting-house, in which morning and evening prayers were daily held.

Concord, when Dr. Langdon took up his residence there, in the summer of 1775, was full of memories of the fight at the North Bridge; and still more so when he preached his Election sermon in May. Speaking of that affair, he said in his sermon: —

"They have not only endeavored to terrify us with fleets and armies sent to our capital, and distressed and put an end to our trade, — particularly that important branch of it, the fishery, — but at length attempted, by a sudden march of a body of troops in the night, to seize

and destroy one of our magazines, formed by the people merely for their own security. . . . By this, as might well be expected, a skirmish was brought on; and it is most evident . . . that the fire began first on the side of the king's troops. At least five or six of our inhabitants were murderously killed by the Regulars at Lexington, before any man attempted to return the fire, and when they were actually complying with the command to disperse: and two more of our brethren were likewise killed at Concord Bridge by a fire from the king's soldiers, before the engagement began on our side. But whatever credit falsehoods transmitted to Great Britain from the other side may gain, the matter may be rested entirely on this, — that he that arms himself to commit a robbery, and demands the traveller's purse, by the terror of instant death, is the first aggressor, though the other should take the advantage of discharging his pistol first, and killing the robber.

"The alarm was sudden, but in a very short time spread far and wide; the nearest neighbors in haste ran together, to assist their brethren and save their country. Not more than three or four hundred met in season, and bravely attacked and repulsed the enemies of liberty, who retreated with great precipitation. . . .

"Our king, as if impelled by some strange fatality, is resolved to reason with us only by the roar of his cannon, and the pointed arguments of muskets and bayonets. Because we refuse submission to the despotic power of a ministerial Parliament, our own sovereign, to whom we have always been ready to swear true allegiance, — whose authority we never meant to cast off, — has given us up to the rage of his ministers; to be seized at sea by the rapacious commanders of every little sloop of war and piratical cutter; and to be plundered and massacred on land by mercenary troops, who know no distinction betwixt an enemy and a brother, between right and wrong, — but only, like brutal pursuers, to hunt and seize the prey pointed out by their masters."

This passage indicates what was almost the universal feeling in the Colonies after that "untoward affair" of the 19th of April. Another point insisted on by Dr. Langdon was perhaps more fully exemplified in his own Province of New Hampshire than in any of the Colonies, — the quiet and almost unanimous submission to the newly created popular authorities. And in the passage now to be cited, it will be seen that this preacher anticipated by more than a year the very argument more tersely put forward by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence:

"By the Law of Nature any body of people, destitute of order and government, may form themselves into a civil society according to their

best prudence, and so provide for their common safety and advantage. When one form is found by the majority not to answer the grand purpose in any tolerable degree, they may by common consent put an end to it and set up another; only this ought not to be attempted without urgent necessity. . . .

"It must be ascribed to some supernatural influence on the minds of the main body of the people through this extensive continent, that they have so universally adopted the method of managing the important affairs necessary to preserve among them a free government, by corresponding committees and congresses, consisting of the wisest and most disinterested patriots in America, chosen by the unbiassed suffrages of the people assembled for that purpose, in their several towns, counties and provinces. So general agreement through so many provinces of so large a country is unexampled in any history; and the effect has exceeded our most sanguine expectations. Universal tumults and all the irregularities and violence of mobbish factions naturally arise when legal authority ceases; but how little of this has appeared in the midst of the late obstructions of civil government! . . . Nothing more than has been absolutely necessary to carry into execution the spirited resolutions of a people too sensible to deliver themselves up to oppression and slavery. . . .

"Order among the people has been remarkably preserved; few crimes have been committed punishable by the judge; even former contentions between one neighbor and another have ceased."

It is plain by these extracts from the utterances of the new President that Hancock and Adams made no mistake in selecting Dr. Langdon as a true patriot, ready to go as far as themselves in asserting the liberties of free-born English subjects. How was he in the other requirements for a college president? Dr. Stiles, in 1779, when in his first year of presidency at Yale, made these observations on the Harvard Presidents whom he had known:—

"Mr. Holyoke was the polite gentleman, of a noble commanding presence, and moderated at Commencements with great dignity. He was perfectly acquainted with academic matters; of a good degree of Literature, both in languages and sciences, particularly in mathematical-mechanic Philosophy; yet was not of great erudition. Qualified, however, exceedingly well for the presidency, especially as he had a good Spirit of Government; which was partly natural to him, partly acquired from President Leverett, who ruled and governed with great dignity. Dr. Locke was scarcely equal to Mr. Holyoke in classical knowledge, but much superior to him in the sciences, and in penetration, judgment



and strength of mind. He was excellent and amiable in government, though he did not equal the dignity of his predecessor. And yet he was a greater literary character. Just entered into the career of glory, his sun went into an eclipse. Dr. Langdon's literary character was similar to President Holyoke's."

It will be inferred from the omission of "a Spirit of Government" in Dr. Langdon's portrait that he was lacking in discipline, and such I conclude to have been the fact. Yet the records of the Corporation and Faculty, which I have examined, do not show half the frequency of insurrections and tumults among the students that appeared under Dr. Holyoke, and less by far than under President Quincy himself, who cites John Eliot as saying of Langdon, "He wanted judgment and a spirit of government." In a letter to Dr. Stiles when he had been nearly five years at Harvard, Dr. Langdon said: "I have met with continual difficulties since I have been in my present station, by the war and the fluctuating medium; yet I do not repine, as I think divine providence pointed out my path of duty." Here is no hint of disorder or the perils of false brethren, of which even St. Paul complained, and which, I judge, were the real cause of his resignation. On the 11th of September, 1780 (the same day that John Eliot wrote to his brother-in-law his gossiping version of the resignation), Dr. Stiles entered in his diary: "The Reverend Dr. Langdon resigned the Presidency of Harvard College on account of the dissatisfaction of the scholars; but not for any immorality or impeachment of his character,—it being venerable for virtue."

At a later date (December 21, 1780) Dr. Stiles writes,—

"Received letters from Mr. Moody, Dummer School master, inclosing from President Langdon his resignation of the presidency, with the acceptance of this resignation by the Overseers, dated Sept. 13. He at the same time received great testimonials of his learning and piety. He has a call to settle again in the work of the ministry at Rowley. This morning I sent a letter to him."

This entry shows that the Corporation did not make public his letter; indeed, they seem to have been rather ashamed of their part in the affair. A month later, (January, 1781) Dr. Stiles writes:—

“ President Langdon was installed Pastor of the church at Hampton Falls. God grant that he enjoy His presence, and a tranquil old age ! This good Gentleman has passed through a great variety in life. His example is a very instructive lesson for me. May I profit this by it, at least, — not to promise myself any great things in life, and least of all any Glory from the Presidency.”

The following October, after a visit to his and Dr. Langdon’s church at Portsmouth, including two hundred and thirty families, Dr. Stiles dined with this “ good Gentleman ” in the small parsonage at Hampton Falls, “ where he is settled over seventy-two families, — salary £42 and eight cords of wood, and on Benevolence.” By this was probably meant that wealthy friends contributed to increase his stipend ; which was soon raised by the town to £60. In accepting the situation at his new parish, where he remained nearly seventeen years, Dr. Langdon wrote : —

“ I have seriously attended the call to be the minister at Hampton Falls, given on the eleventh day of December, 1780, — to devote my labors in the ministry of the Gospel to the service of the Parish. Notwithstanding some discouragements which have appeared in my way, and the earnest applications which have been made to me by some other parishes, where there was a prospect of a peaceable and quiet settlement, — I cannot but apprehend it to be my duty to comply with the call of this Parish.

“ Considering the unhappy divided state they have been in for so many years past, and hoping I am not mistaken in judging it to be a call from God, by the intimation of his Providence, I do hereby declare my acceptance of their call, together with the provision made for that part of my support which is granted, — the deficiency of which is to be made up by the Brethren of the church and congregation. And relying on the gracious assistance of our Lord Jesus Christ, I shall make it my constant care and labor to fulfil the duties of the Gospel Ministry in this place, to the utmost of my abilities, so long as God shall continue me among this people.”

This promise was faithfully kept. His predecessor, Paine Wingate, a brother-in-law of Colonel Timothy Pickering, and with something of the stiffness of that old Essex Cato, had kept the town in a broil for years, but finally withdrew in 1776, and engaged in political life. Dr. Langdon avoided that distraction, although he accepted the choice of the town as delegate to the State Convention to ratify the Federal Consti-

tution of 1787, and in that position had a large share in persuading the rural democracy of New Hampshire to accept the work of Washington, Madison, Hamilton, and their associates. This brought him into active association with his old Portsmouth hearers and friends, John and Woodbury Langdon, and with General Sullivan and the Gilmans of Exeter.

Having now brought back Dr. Langdon to his earliest task of indoctrination and pastoral care, it is time to consider where he stood theologically. A century and a quarter ago, as in more recent days, Harvard College was suspected of heresies in dogma. Andrew Eliot, who may have been something of a talebearer and mischief-maker like his brother John, told Dr. Stiles, in 1778, that he wished Stiles were President at Harvard; and in July, 1778, his father, Dr. Andrew Eliot, anxiously wrote:—

“In a letter from my son by the last post, he says, ‘I have received a letter from Mr. Bartlett wherein he tells me that Mr. Jonathan Bird of Hartford, a candidate for the ministry, was his informer relative to the prevalence of Deism at Harvard College. “He told me,” says Mr. Bartlett, “that one half, or about half of said College were supposed to be Deists; and also that two ordained ministers not far from Boston were thought to be Deists.” He did not name them, nor tell me who was his informer. I should rejoice if this should prove a mistake.’ Who Mr. Bird is I know not. If he be a son to Mr. Bird of New Haven, I should think he was embittered by his father, who was expelled from Cambridge.”

This charge of Deism, of course, was a slander. But Dr. Stiles in the summer of 1777 seems to have had some question about Dr. Langdon’s soundness on Original Sin, Election, etc., and drew him out one day at Portsmouth, when the President was in vacation and visiting his former congregation. This is Dr. Stiles’s report of the conversation:—

“The President has some peculiar ideas in Theology. He is no Socinian. The soul that suffered in the body of Christ was not a human soul, nor was it the essential Deity, but the λόγος,—the first-born of every creature, a distinct intelligence from that of Jehovah, but intimately united with Deity, so that God is in him. The original state of this world was such that both the vegetable and animal world were subject to mutation, revolution, Death: particularly that all animals would after a term die, and man among the rest. This was the natural state.

But God promised Adam in Paradise an exemption from death if he obeyed; but if he disobeyed he should die, — that is, be left to the course of nature. This death Adam understood to be a cessation of being; it was not a futurity and perpetuity of misery and suffering. It really would have been annihilation, had it not been for the purposes of Grace. And so his posterity had no concern in his sin, upon the first covenant or command. Least of all was it a part of Adam's penalty that he should derive guilt and corrupt nature to his offspring. And so he was not, in this sense, originally a federal head. But upon God's purposing to continue Adam in existence for the purpose of Grace, he then became the natural head of his posterity: and, as the sentence of death was not reversed, he became a federal head, to the purpose of bringing his posterity into a world under a natural state of animal mortality, instead of that exemption from this natural mortality promised to Adam; and though not promised to his seed, yet would probably have been granted to them also. Hence Adam is and becomes a federal head (if not before, yet) after the Fall to all his posterity; so that thereby they are subject to the death of the body; and so 'in Adam all die.' Born into a state of sin, temptation and mortality, they all sin; and the world lieth in wickedness, and they deserve future as well as present punishment. God was disposed, from the benignity of his nature, to shew mercy; but it was necessary for the dignity of his government that he should shew a testimony of his abhorrence of Sin. This was done in the sufferings of the Mediator, through whom God is reconciling the world. . . . I did not well see his ideas of Christ's atonement and satisfaction. He held Christ's sufferings vicarious, and beyond those of the Martyrs, and so as to be a testimony of God's displeasure against sin, but not equal to the sufferings due to sin, — the dignity of the person rendering a less suffering an adequate and sufficient testimony, against sin. But I did perceive that in his mind satisfaction arose from and consisted in the created nature of Jesus Christ being upheld by Omnipotence, and so enabled in a few hours to sustain a load of intense woe, equal to the misery which lay upon the elect, and yet he seemed to conceive a suffering laid upon him, above all the pains of natural death, (i. e. of bodily death, even by the torture of Crucifixion) something to testify the divine displeasure against sin.

"The Doctor was (like Dr. Watts), I suppose, originally initiated in Calvinism, and became, in the first of his ministry, of the connection of Mr. Whitefield, and continues so to this day. An extensive acquaintance, and a disposition to converse upon and discuss every subject, obliged him to meet the objections both of Deists, Arians, Arminians, Socinians. Their artillery carried metal rather too heavy for his understanding. However, he always appeared to have stood the attack; yet in many places was giving ground. Like a generous and noble

mind, he entered with spirit into the field of FREE INQUIRY; he cleared much ground, and settled many points profoundly, justly, masterly, and like an enlightened Divine; and as to much, also, he is left plunged in unfinished researches. Guyse and Doddridge he loves and esteems; but Taylor, whom he renounces, I think, has got the ascendancy and greatest hold of his reasoning powers. And yet his notions on Original Sin are neither Locke's nor Taylor's, but Dr. — [Edwards's?] whose treatise on that subject is unpublished."

Through the mist of an obsolete terminology, I seem to recognize here a rational attempt to free himself from the heavy fetters of Calvinism, in which the New England mind lay so sadly imprisoned for two centuries. When I was in Harvard College (1854), there came over from Shropshire a nephew of Bishop Heber, Thomas Cholmondeley, uncle of the more recent novelist, Mary Cholmondeley, who stepped out to Cambridge to see a few of us, and who had before visited Emerson and Thoreau at Concord. When Emerson had introduced me to him, as we were walking towards the Walden woods, and the English theologian was returning from his solitary walk therein, Emerson went on to describe him to me. "He is better acquainted with *things* than most travelling Englishmen; they are a singularly verdant race. The Englishman who stays at home, and attends to what he knows, is one of the wisest of mankind; but their travellers are most unobservant and self-complacent. Cholmondeley told me that he went to hear a Mr. Parker in Boston, — thought him able, but was shocked at some of his doctrines. He then began talking to me [Emerson] about Original Sin, and such things; but I said, 'I see you are speaking of something which had a meaning once, and the world got good from it, but which is now grown obsolete. Those words formerly stood for something, — but not now.'" We must say the same, I think, of Dr. Langdon's theory of death and salvation, as interpreted by Dr. Stiles. The latter looked on himself as "Evangelical," but had doubts about his Portsmouth preceder in the First Church pulpit. In another part of the diary, speaking of his congregation at Portsmouth (whence he was taken in 1778 to preside over Yale College, thereby putting Dr. Dwight's nose out of joint, as the ungodly said), Dr. Stiles observed: —

"The more polite part were ambitious of having a learned sensible man; the middling and lower people were for an Evangelical preacher,

whether learned or not, — they had not found these united in one man. The Evangelical preacher they found in me, and were so united that the higher and more fashionable part acquiesced ; though themselves could have wished one to have preached more in the air of St. James or Paris ; and yet I am told it is their hearty desire for themselves, as well as the flock. They all say that they shall never be so united again.”

It is probable that Dr. Langdon had pleased this Portsmouth parish equally well, and that he had “ the air of St. James [meaning the palace and not the Apostle] or Paris ” rather more than Dr. Stiles. The latter expressed surprise, July 28, 1777, that “ Dr. Langdon understands all the Apocalypse ” ; in evidence of which the good old man at Hampton Falls in 1791 published, through his friend Isaiah Thomas at Worcester, “ Observations on the Revelation of Jesus Christ to St. John. Which comprehend the most approved sentiments of the celebrated Mr. Mede, Mr. Lowman, Bishop Newton, and other noted Writers on this Book ; and cast much additional Light on the more obscure Prophecies ; especially those which point out the Time of the RISE AND FALL OF ANTICHRIST.”

This work (337 pages) was in part delivered as sermons to his seventy families at Hampton Falls, sometimes standing in the broad aisle, when a recently broken leg kept him from mounting the stairs to the tall pulpit under the sounding-board, which I well remember. Dr. Langdon’s Antichrist was the Roman Church, which, in the storm of the French Revolution, seemed to be falling like the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse. He thus sets forth his view : —

“ The capital of the empire of Antichrist is repeatedly called Babylon in the Revelation. The name is figurative and mystical : Rome is the city really meant. . . . We are plainly informed in the seventeenth chapter what kings are to be employed in destroying the great harlot, the city and Church of Rome : the very kings who at first agreed in one creed, and gave their power to the Beast. These kings will at length entirely change their minds, and become the most zealous enemies to that ecclesiastical empire which they themselves had established. They will find out that Rome has caused insurrections against them, and fomented rebellions and seditions ; and that the religion they have promoted has drained away their wealth, encouraged and multiplied drones in society, and impoverished and diminished their subjects. In the execution of vengeance, the river of wealth which was continually flow-

ing through Rome and the Church will be dried up. Vast revenues which the popes formerly received have been greatly diminished by the Protestant Reformation. Moreover, when the Church of Rome is no longer mixed with the civil polity of the kingdoms, her sources of strength as well as wealth will be cut off, and the way prepared for her utter ruin. Likewise, the dissolution of the numerous orders of ecclesiastics in the several kingdoms, which have been the gates and bars of Rome, will leave her exposed to a sudden assault, which may at once bring down all her power. Of this we have already seen some approaches, in the total suppression of the order of Jesuits, and the methods taken in several Roman Catholic kingdoms for the abolition of convents. The banishment of the Jesuits, . . . with the suppression of convents, may naturally be considered among the things signified by the Sixth Vial. . . . The Bishops of Rome had obtained a grant of supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the western churches, A.D. 379, and immediately began to exercise it. Of this jurisdiction the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton has produced abundant proof, in his observations of the power of the eleventh horn of Daniel's fourth Beast."

Neither Newton nor Langdon, if now living, would expound Daniel or Revelations; these two books being no longer regarded by scholars as prophecy, but as history mingled with invective and fable. Yet a century ago it would have been sad heresy to intimate that any of the alleged canonical books of the Bible were to be read exactly like other books; and prediction by divine order has ceased to interest minds of the rank of Langdon's or Newton's. When, therefore, Quincy spoke of Dr. Langdon as "credulous and visionary," he probably had in mind such writings as the above. But how few of the contemporaries of Dr. Langdon rose above the religious traditions in which they had been educated! It appears that Langdon had been computing and astrologizing on the meaning of the Vials and Horns and Beasts in the Apocalypse for half a century when he published this book, and had announced to his friends that nothing "directly tending to the destruction of Antichrist's empire might be expected until about the year 1760." Then it came; the Jesuits lost control and were banished,—next came the American Revolution; and now, in 1791, the outlook is dark for Antichrist:—

"The world is roused to a sense of civil and religious liberty by the spirit of America. France is searching the foundations of despotism,

and establishing on its ruins the freedom of a great nation ; and God has given them a king to be the restorer of liberty, and a second Washington to command their national troops. May we not look for events more and more remarkable, until all the nations of Europe shake off the yoke of ecclesiastical tyranny, and assert the rights of nations and of conscience ? ”

This was a generous anticipation, shared by Coleridge and Wordsworth, and thousands of the best men of the eighteenth century ; and it is to the credit of the old doctor of divinity that he kept so youthful an outlook on the world, after all his experiences. What Dr. Stiles reported in 1777, in regard to Dr. Langdon’s peculiar opinions, was confirmed by Langdon himself in 1794, when he printed at Exeter, New Hampshire, his “ Remarks on Dr. Hopkins’ System of Doctrines.” This was perhaps his last publication, and in style it is one of the best, — using now and then that mild wit which he had for purposes of gentle satire. As is well known, though few now trouble themselves about Dr. Hopkins and his Hopkinsians, they laid great stress on “ disinterested benevolence,” which phrase gives point to this passage in Dr. Langdon’s “ Remarks ” : —

“ That I may not be thought deficient in the great duty of disinterested benevolence, I will leave Dr. Hopkins in the full enjoyment of his happiness in the prospect of that millennium which he has so particularly described. That there will be a millennium I cannot doubt. But that all wicked men will first of all be destroyed by wars, pestilence, earthquakes, famine, etc., and none but good Christians remain, who will propagate their own faith from generation to generation, until Gog and Magog arise, is not quite so clear. Yet, since he is so very confident that such a happy state is drawing nigh, as to write a dedication of his work to the Inhabitants of the world in that glorious Era, I will say nothing to prevent its reaching to their time.”

John Eliot, in his youthful attack on the new President of his College, in 1774, scoffs a little at Dr. Langdon’s exposition of Romans. It is clear that the worthy pastor had a theory about Paul and the two long Epistles ascribed to him, — Romans and Hebrews. He told Dr. Stiles that they were very clear to him ; and in this final essay in rebuke of Dr. Hopkins, he says : —

“ I was very unwilling to find any fault, and hoped to see everything written with clearness, and according to the simplicity of the Gospel.



But my hope has been greatly disappointed. I see all the subtilities of artful reasoning made use of, instead of a plain manifestation of the truth. If the Apostles had gone through the world preaching in the same manner, few would have understood them, and they must have taken very particular pains with every new convert, to acquaint him fully with their meaning, and teach him all the refinements of their system. But they were content with plain reasoning from facts, addressing themselves to the common sense of mankind. What they taught was always important, never designed to amuse with useless speculations or curious questions, but to enlighten the understanding, and bring men into subjection to Christ's government. The Holy Spirit has designedly given Christians a concise system of those evangelical doctrines which the Apostles preached everywhere, in two excellent Epistles of Paul, to the Romans and to the Hebrews."

Dr. Langdon continued to preach until within a few weeks of his death, which preceded that of Washington by little more than two years, though he was nine years older than the General. His friend Dr. Stiles, though four years younger than Dr. Langdon, died in 1795, two years earlier. They had been good friends for many years, and it was with Dr. Langdon's entire good will that Dr. Stiles succeeded him for a year or two in the great Portsmouth parish, which both of them left to become college presidents. Dr. Langdon retained his interest in the Portsmouth house till death,<sup>1</sup> and it passed, in consequence of his daughter's marriage with Dr. John Goddard, into the possession of that gentleman. At his death or earlier it went to his daughter, the granddaughter of Dr. Langdon, whose married name was Pickering, and it is her daughter, Mrs. Mary Pickering Harris, who now owns and occupies it. No portrait of President Langdon has yet been found; and yet, like his distinguished neighbor in Hampton Falls, Colonel, Judge, Speaker, and President Weare, he was not too modest to sit for his picture.<sup>2</sup> He

<sup>1</sup> By his will it appears that Dr. Langdon had made a deed of gift of this house to his son Richard, then of Portsmouth; but he afterward removed to North Carolina, and the house passed to his sister, Mrs. Goddard, who left it to her daughter, Mrs. Pickering.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Paul H. Langdon, of Augusta, Georgia, writes me that there was a portrait of his great-grandfather the Doctor; that it was taken to Worcester and got into the "Library or Academy of Arts and Sciences at Worcester," but that in moving into a new building it was lost, or fell into the possession of some one unknown. He adds: "Mr. D. S. Messenger was one of the trustees of that library, and informed me that he had made diligent effort to find the portrait.

died November 27, 1797, leaving a small but very learned library to "the Church at Hampton Falls for the Use of the Ministry." Some thirty or forty volumes out of more than a hundred still remain there, and have a special case in the Town Library. A few of them, purchased through my mediation by Theodore Parker, are now in the Boston Public Library; others are scattered among the descendants of his successors in the pulpit or of his parishioners.

The College presidency of Langdon, though a conspicuous episode in his active life of seventy-four years, was but an episode; laborious and painful in its conditions, but more honorable to him than to those who caused his election and his retirement. He was installed by a kind of subterfuge on the part of the Fellows, in order to avoid admitting the new mandamus Councillors and the lieutenant-governor of the Province as Overseers, or allowing the question of their right to be raised. It was feared or known that they would oppose, and so the clerical Overseers waived their right to be present at the instalment. We owe a knowledge of this fact to the invaluable diary of Dr. Stiles, which says (1774), —

"October 28, at an adjourned meeting, the Overseers voted to leave the instalment to the Fellows, who installed Dr. Langdon without the presence of the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor and Council; and thus avoided determining the question whether the new Councillors were Overseers."

From the same diary we learn the value of the College funds and the salaries of the President and professors. All the funds in 1774, including the Hollis funds, gave an income of £900; the General Court gave £450 yearly, and the fees, etc. brought up the income to £1,500 in Lawful money, — \$5,000. The President had from the Province grant, £200, and expected £240 in fees; but Dr. Langdon never received so much. Two professors got £150 each; the other, £200;

His son-in-law, James Greene, a lawyer of Worcester, or some member of his family may be able to give information about it. It may possibly have been found since Mr. Messenger's death." It has occurred to me that this portrait may have been sent to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences at *Boston*, of which Dr. Langdon was an original charter member, for there has never been a society of that name at Worcester. Should any of my readers know any portrait, even a small silhouette, of Dr. Langdon, at any period of his life, I will thank him to communicate with me at Concord, Massachusetts. — F. B. S.

the four tutors £100 each, and the malcontent librarian £50. It is doubtful if Dr. Langdon's yearly salary averaged £150 in silver; but he had property in New Hampshire, and was comparatively independent, — which makes the account by John Eliot, soon to be quoted, seem improbable in several points. But few public exercises occurred during his six years' presidency, owing to the disturbed times; but of two exhibitions, 1779 and 1780, we have accounts. Dr. Stiles writes:

June 18, 1779. "A new and very public examination of candidates for the degree of A.B. was celebrated at Harvard College, — at least Examination was attended in an uncommon manner. The Corporation and Overseers were present on the occasion. In the afternoon there was a procession to the Meeting-house, when President Langdon began with prayer, and then delivered a Latin Oration. There followed a salutatory Oration, a forensic Dispute, syllogistic Disputes in Latin on two questions; an Hebrew Oration, a Dialogue, an Anthem. These were all the academic exercises of Commencement, except conferring degrees upon the candidates. Yet the Corporation, with consent of the Overseers, conferred the doctorate of Laws upon Major General Gates, and the French consul residing at Boston."

This was three years after the same degree was given to Washington. The diploma conferring that honor was composed by Dr. Langdon, and stands on the records of the Corporation in his bold and legible script. It recited in picturesque Latin Washington's public career up to April, 1776, and spoke of him as "*Imperator præclarus, cujus scientia et amor patriæ undique patent*"; who had been chosen to that "*Consessus Americanus celeberrimus*" by his fellow-citizens; "*deinde, postulante patria, sedem in Virginia amœnissimam et res proprias perlubenter reliquit, ut per omnes castrorum labores et pericula, nulla mercede accepta, Nov-Angliam ab armis Britannorum, iniquis et crudelibus, liberaret, et Colonias ceteras tueretur.*"

Then, after briefly relating his rescue of Boston from the "*naves et copias hostium*," the diploma goes on to confer the grade J.U.D., commonly abbreviated now LL.D., thus: —

"*Sciatis igitur, quod nos Præses et Socii Collegii Harvardini in Cantabrigia Nov-Anglorum (consentientibus honorandis admodum et reverendis Academiæ nostræ Inspectoribus) Dominum supradictum, summo honore dignum, Georgium Washington, Doctorem Utriusque*

*Juris, tum Naturæ et Gentium, tum Civilis, statuimus et creavimus, eique simul dedimus et concessimus omnia jura, privilegia et honores ad istum gradum pertinentia.*"

The only criticism I would make on the Latinity of this document is that an occasional use of "atque" and its abbreviation "ac" would relieve the uniformity of the dozen "ets" in it.

In September, 1779, Dr. Langdon had a shaping hand in those articles of the Massachusetts State Constitution that relate to Harvard College; which in this formal document is styled "the University at Cambridge," varying from the form used in honoring Washington. The provisions relating to the University have been proved by experience to be sagacious and useful,—qualities that mark the work of Langdon whenever he touched on public affairs and left his clerical chimeras and predictions. Clarendon's objurgation against the English clergy—"who know the least and take the worst measure of human affairs, of all mankind that can write and read"—could never apply to this wise cleric.

In the spring of 1780, shortly before his resignation, the College gave a May Exhibition, of which I find on the records this programme, with notes of identification added by me:—

"Latin salutatory, by David Leonard Barnes;

Forensic Dispute on Emigration, by Dudley Atkins Tyng of Newburyport, and George Henry Hall.

An English Dialogue by Nehemiah Mason, Arnold Welles and Samuel Williams.

A Hebrew Oration, by Isaac Reed.

A Greek Dialogue by Bezaleel Howard and Elijah Paine, (of Vermont).

A Forensic Dispute on Toleration, by Joseph Prince, T. W. Russell and Jacob White.

An Original Composition (English) by Peter French.

A Poetic Composition on the Progress of Literature, by Samuel Dexter of Boston, afterward Secretary of War, etc. under Madison.

A Latin Dialogue, by John Davis of Plymouth, afterward Judge and President of the Historical Society,—and Abiel Heywood of Concord,—afterward town physician and town clerk there for many years.

A Latin Ode, by William Crosswell.

Some Astronomical Calculations, by a student not named."

I also find that some theses were proposed (probably by the President) which the Faculty unanimously disclaimed, in the following summer. This may have been connected with the insubordination now to be recounted.

The most minute statement concerning President Langdon's resignation that I have seen in print is found in a letter of September 11, 1780, from the same John Eliot,—by this time a settled minister in his father's Boston church and an Overseer of the College. It is fuller than the account given by Quincy, though the latter does more justice to Dr. Langdon's letter, and this is its substance,—the date being two days before the Overseers and Corporation accepted the resignation:—

“ I shall be very particular in informing you of every circumstance [to Dr. Belknap at Dover], for I know you to be a very particular man, and that you are accurate in collecting things in order to form an opinion, and as accurate in your judgment when all circumstances are before you. The President has long been growing unpopular, more especially among the students of the College. So disgusting hath he been in his whole deportment, that they would have held him in detestation, if this sensation had not been absorbed in mere thorough contempt. Yet, after all which can be said, all his foibles did not amount to a vice when completely converged into one point of view; much less unworthy doth he appear when these are separated from each other, and blended with his good qualities. As to the total disqualification for the office he sustained, I always had the same opinion which I hold now, that he was no ways proper to appear in the station; and that no man who wished well to him or to the interest of Harvard College would, *with the same opinion as mine own*, not rather have seen him elsewhere.

[This amounts to saying that John Eliot, at the sapient age of twenty, had formed an opinion which he continued to hold at six-and-twenty; and that if others held the same opinion, they would think as John Eliot did,—which resembles an identical equation]. “ *Sed sic visum est superis*,—at least to the Corporation, who were the immediate electors.

“ His resignation was as surprising to me as it was to any person the furthest distant from the College. It happened, it seems, in this manner. The scholars unanimously formed a petition, which was to be presented to the Corporation, begging them to remove the President. What the articles were can be known but imperfectly, as they came to a determination to conceal the contents. Among other things, tho', I hear that his unbecoming way of addressing the Deity was one. There

was a committee chosen to acquaint the President with the petition, who addressed him in these words: 'As a man of genius and knowledge we respect you; as a man of piety and virtue we venerate you; as a President we despise you.'"

This does not seem a very probable account, and is not confirmed by President Quincy, who seems to have had no difficulty in ascertaining the charges made by the three upper classes with the connivance of Librarian Winthrop. They were "impiety, heterodoxy, unfitness for the office of preacher of the Christian religion, and still more for that of President." If the Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors, to the number of ninety, are allowed to be better judges of piety, orthodoxy, and fitness to preach than the thousands of grave men and women to whom Dr. Langdon had been preaching for a whole generation, and the thousand or more to whom he preached acceptably for seventeen years longer, — which does not look reasonable at first thought, — then these charges might be said to have some foundation. Mr. Quincy says, however: "There was not a shadow of foundation for any one of these charges except the last, — of which the spirit in which this insolence was received may be considered an evidence." It might be an *indication*, but hardly *evidence*, as the term is understood in law. No other evidence appears, except what Mr. Quincy terms "a combination of students, to whom he had become obnoxious, and whose dissatisfaction was countenanced, if not excited, by men connected with the government of the institution." He adds that Dr. Langdon was ignorant of his unpopularity; which, in a man so sensitive, is very good evidence that it was no more than one of those temporary gusts of feeling from which President Quincy himself suffered while in office. But let us hear the impartial and compassionate young Christian Endeavorer further, — I mean John Eliot, æt. 26: —

"Dr. Langdon now added another to his many imprudences. He declared to the scholars that he was sensible of his incapacity for the office, imputing it to the weak state of his nerves, and gave them a promise that he would resign. He prepared his resignation to be presented to the Board of Overseers, at their meeting last Thursday. [This would be September 7, if Eliot's letter is correctly dated; but in fact it was received by the Corporation September 1 and accepted

September 13,—six years, lacking a month, since the Corporation installed him without the presence of the Overseers, in order to avoid recognizing the Royal Councillors as Overseers.]

“The forthputting, officious gentleman, Dr. Gordon [the historian of our Revolution, then preaching at Roxbury, and an Overseer], now suffered his zeal to boil over, and persuaded the President (*ut credo*) that he might still remain in office, and that *he* would be his advocate at the Board of Overseers. At the meeting Mr. Bowdoin read the resignation. It was well drawn up. Nothing was said of the uneasiness with the students. One would suppose the whole originated with himself. He said the place was disagreeable to him; that he found himself so debilitated by nervous disorders that he could not go through with his course of duty. ‘My memory fails,’ said he, ‘my taste for academical studies decreases; my fondness for shew and public notice is lost; and I wish heartily to retire.’ [I have already pointed out that the letter does not warrant this construction.] He then described very pathetically the disadvantageous circumstances of his coming to Cambridge, and the many losses and troubles he had met with during his continuance there; requesting that he might live in the provincial mansion house, etc.”

He really only asked that his family might remain there till his house in Portsmouth was ready; and there is nothing to show that he lived there a day after September 13. Early in October, the General Court being in session, he presented a schedule of his legal salary for five years, ten months, and thirty days, at £200 in specie per annum, and amounting to £1182 13s. 6d. — of which he had received the equivalent of only £685 7s. 11d. This left a balance due him of £497 5s. 7d. The Senate and the House voted him £497 10s. at once; and a warrant for that sum was drawn up on October 3, twenty days after his resignation took effect, and put in Dr. Langdon's hands. This original warrant may be seen in the Secretary's archives at the State House, where I recently examined it. It gives him the sum named (about \$1656), “for and in consideration of his faithful discharge of the duties of the office of President, and to enable him to remove his family and effects.” Mr. Quincy says that the Overseers “acknowledged the reasonableness of his requests, and the inadequacy of his salary and emoluments for his support, and engaged to use their influence with the legislature to obtain a grant in compensation for the deficiencies.” Probably they did so, though no record of this appears on the files of the General Court, where

Dr. Langdon's petitions and the votes of the two houses are recorded.

John Eliot went on in his sympathetic account thus :—

“Dr. Langdon is really an object of pity. Even the scholars who have been so active in his dismission think so. They attested to his good character in a unanimous vote presented to the Overseers, wherein they mentioned him as a man of learning, and most excellent character, rendered him many thanks for his past services, and expressed the most earnest desire that the remainder of his days may be comfortable and happy. This vote is also accompanied with a subscription for something by way of present. I believe that many thousand dollars will be subscribed for him, if Gordon don't spoil the whole by his impertinence and nonsensical reveries. He blazed away at the meeting; insisted upon it that this whole proceeding arose from the mere malice of one of the governors of the College (Mr. Winthrop the librarian), who had the impudence to tell Mr. and Mrs. Langdon to their heads that he had long sought an opportunity to revenge an affront offered to him by the President some years since, and now that he was gratified.”

*Tantæne animis celestibus iræ?* I apprehend this is the only instance, in the long story of Dr. Langdon's life, when he “offered an affront” to anybody. He was a man of sincere politeness and, as his conduct on this occasion showed, of admirable Christian forgiveness; taking, in the true spirit of a gentleman, the whole burden of his withdrawal upon himself, but as little likely to accept a present from the insurgents who had insulted him as President Quincy himself. As for this alleged subscription of “many thousand dollars,” it is nowhere heard of except in this Eliot letter, so full of guesses and predictions. Dr. Langdon's statement to the General Court shows that, in May preceding, \$5,000 in paper only meant in silver \$150, and would hardly pay his support for two months, as prices then were. Moreover, the students were themselves so poor that they asked to be excused from Commencement exercises because they could not afford the cost; so that we may suppose this lordly subscription existed mainly in the warm imagination of Eliot. Considering how he had been treated, and was to be still further, by those who had contracted to pay him his salary, Dr. Langdon must have felt as did that minister who, taking up a collection and getting nothing but three buttons and a counterfeit bill, raised his hands to Heaven from his inverted hat, and said, “I thank



Thee, O Lord, that I have got my hat back from this congregation." Eliot goes on : —

Dr. Gordon "moved the matter should be inquired into, the students should be severely censured, and the whole scene of iniquity should be unfolded. *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*, he repeated, and seemed in a pet, as if the rest of us were a party joined together to destroy the President. We felt as much as he could be sensible of, but judged very differently from him about the whole affair. We see the absolute necessity of his leaving Cambridge, which the Doctor himself could not deny; notwithstanding him, aim to do something. We thought it best he should depart as privately as possible, that the circumstances might not be too much the subject of speculation, but that things might appear as if all things came and were determined by himself. We knew that a little matter would cause the subscription paper to flag, and that any measures to censure the students would provoke them to withdraw their generosity."

Messieurs the students seem to have been absolutely in control of the College in this strange affair, — far more so than when, in 1776, they revolted in a body, at the leading of Asa Dunbar, grandfather of Henry Thoreau, rather than put up with bad butter at their Commons. Finally, says Eliot, their submissive Overseer: "For mine own part, I wish that they had first accepted the resignation; but the Overseers saw fit to appoint a committee, for the mere formality of a consultation with him, and they are to report next Thursday" (September 14). When that day came, the Corporation had accepted the resignation, which Dr. Langdon had probably never thought of withdrawing, and he soon left Cambridge, allowing the shabby Overseers and Corporation to make their own disposal of the publicity of their conduct, and the "generosity" of the impudent students and envious Faculty. They seem to have carried out the Eliot idea of secrecy; for they never published Dr. Langdon's letter, and almost no mention of the matter remains on the files of the College correspondence, so far as I can discover. Mr. Quincy found a letter of Mr. Storer, the successor of Hancock as Treasurer (October 20, 1781), in which that member of the Corporation asserted his opinion that if Dr. Langdon had asked their advice, the Corporation would have requested him "to have deferred your intention to some future time." And Mr. Quincy adds : —

"It is probable that Dr. Langdon became subsequently aware that the students had been made the instruments of others, possibly of men connected with the government of the institution, and that the feeling of self-distrust, which led to his resignation, had been succeeded by feelings of a very different character."

For "self-distrust" I should here read "self-respect," and there is no reason to suppose that this feeling ever changed. When Dr. Langdon found that his warrant on the State Treasurer, Henry Gardner, for about \$1,656 in "bills of the new emission" could not be paid in October, 1780, because Mr. Gardner alleged there was no money in the Treasury, he waited patiently till September 3, 1782, when upon a petition from him of the previous summer the General Court referred it to a Committee, which reported in the Senate, July 3, 1783, that the full sum of £497 10s. should be paid in silver. The Senate voted this. Samuel Adams, the old and stanch friend of Dr. Langdon, signed the resolve as President of the Senate in a trembling hand, and sent it down to the House, which stingily non-concurred, July 11, 1783. Nothing further was done until March 22, 1784, when the Senate again passed a resolve, again signed by Adams as President, by Tristram Dalton as Speaker of the House, and by John Hancock as Governor, that the sum of £320 should be paid to Dr. Langdon in specie, "on condition of his returning the warrant of 1780 for £497 10s. to the Treasury." Upon this the Hampton Falls pastor, in a petition dated June 8, 1784, again addressed the repudiators of Massachusetts in a petition thus:—

That your Petitioner accepted a call from the Honorable Corporation and Overseers of Harvard College to the office of President of that University, and was introduced into that office on the 14th day of October, 1774: that in the full prospect of the horrors of war, added to the ordinary difficulties and labors of that important station, he nevertheless was encouraged to engage both in the service of the College and the liberties of his Country, by a persuasion that he might securely rely on the public honor for the same support which had for many years been granted to the Presidents of that literary Society:

That when he found both his body and mind so much overborne with extreme burdens and fatigue that it was best to resign his office, it appeared that his expenses had very much exceeded the annual grants; and that he could not pay the sums which he had borrowed to defray his necessary expenses.

That your petitioner in 1780 presented to the General Court then sitting, a true state of the arrearages of his salary, amounting to £497 5s. 7d. lawful silver money; upon which the General Court granted the sum of £497 10s. ; for which he received a warrant to be paid in bills of the new emission, which the Court then estimated, upon the authority of Congress, as equal to silver. That your petitioner repeatedly presented the said warrant to the Treasurer, as long as there seemed any ground of hope that the aforesaid bills might obtain a currency at their original value; but never could procure payment, — the Treasury not being supplied.

That ever since it became evident that the said emission was greatly depreciated, your petitioner has been endeavoring to obtain his just arrearages by applying to the General Court for a new warrant on the Treasury; that the Resolve passed in the last Court, on the 23rd of March, granting only £320 specie, in lieu of £497 10s. specie, (which is justly due according to the rules of Honor and Equity, as may easily appear by a review of the State of the account annexed to this petition), *would suggest to your petitioner very painful ideas*, if he did not persuade himself that the said Resolve was founded on some misapprehension of the real state of the case :

That your petitioner is not able to discover any reason why the full sum should not be granted in specie, together with the interest of what has been so long due; especially as he himself is paying interest for money which the defect of the annual grants constrained him to borrow.

Your petitioner therefore earnestly looks up to this August Court, in which he views the collected wisdom and justice of a most respectable Common-wealth, and prays that your Honors would rectify the mistake on which the Resolve of last March in this case is evidently founded, and grant him the balance due for his services while in office, with the interest, — not as if his claim had been only in bills, at a depreciated value, but as it really was and is due in specie: that, after the peculiar labors and difficulties he endured in his public station, and hearty exertions in the cause of his country, he may not be cut off from that support which has been readily granted to Presidents of that Society not exposed to the same hardships and dangers.

And your petitioner shall ever pray, etc.

SAM'L LANGDON.

This plain and convincing statement was referred, June 14, 1784, to a committee consisting of Abraham Fuller of the Senate and Thatcher and Mitchell of the House, who examined the matter in the recess of the General Court, and found the following state of the account: —

## WHOLE AMOUNT OF SUMS RECEIVED BY PRESIDENT LANGDON.

	Paper,	Specie,
1775, Oct. 14,	£200,	£200.
1777, Feb. 20,	224, 5. 5.	224, 5. 5.
1778, Feb. 2,	200,	56, 19, 7.
1778, July 16,	200,	45, 13, 3.
1779, April 1,	123, 18	11, 4, 5.
1779, May 18,	180,	13, 18, 10.
1779, June 19,	696, 2,	48, 15, 7.
1780, Feb. 1,	£2000,	60, 4, 1.
1780, May 11,	£5000, <sup>1</sup>	£102, 0, 10.
	(not footed)	£763, 1, 5.
1784, March 23, Grant,		£320.
	Received,	£1083, 2.
The whole amount of his salary at £200, per an.		1182, 13, 6.
Balance,		99, 11, 6.
1784, Oct. 27,	It don't appear that Doct.	
	Langdon has ever received a warrant for £320, agreeable to a Resolve of the 23rd March, 1784, which was to be consideration in full for his service.	
	(signed)	JOHN DEMING,
		THOS. WALLEY,
		<i>Committee.</i>

The Committee (Fuller, Thatcher, and Mitchell) reported a Resolve for £320, in full for all services (on condition that Dr. Langdon return the warrant for the larger sum, issued October 3, 1780), with the addition of the balance shown above, of £99, 11, 6, to bring the sum in specie up to the amount due. It passed the Senate, November 8, 1784, Adams again signing it, was sent down to the House, and again the House stingily non-concurred. Dr. Langdon had declined to take out the warrant for £320, and on the 18th of January, 1785, he thus wrote to the Speaker of the House from Hampton Falls:—

S<sup>r</sup>, — I have lately discovered an error inadvertently committed by me in that State of my account which accompanied my petition to the honored Court for the year 1782. I have given credit for £2,000 received February 1, and again for £5,000 received on May 11, (1780). Whereas the former grant was 2,000 and the latter 3,000, the whole sum for that year being but £5,000 ; so that there is an error of £2,000

<sup>1</sup> Error, see below ; it should be £3000.

against myself, which may easily appear by the record of the said grants. But yet the sums carried off against the aforesaid grants, as reduced to silver, in my account stand right, as the grants really were made; so that the only error lies in writing 5,000 instead of 3,000. I pray, therefore, that you would convey this information to the Court if you think proper; together with this additional plea in support of my petition, — viz. that £200 a year having been found necessary for many years past, to defray the charges of the support of the Presidents of the College, it cannot be supposed that less than half that sum was sufficient, when every article of provision and clothing was nearly double to the present price. And every man must think it very injurious to perform the duties of a public and important office, in the midst of the most extraordinary disadvantages and difficulties, and be obliged to furnish the greatest part of the costs of his own support.

Submitting the foregoing to your discretion, I am, S<sup>r</sup>, your very obedient serv<sup>t</sup>,

SAM'L LANGDON.

The Honorable SAMUEL ALLEN OTIS, Speaker of the  
Assembly of the C. Wealth of Massachusetts.

Whether the good man did accept the reduction in his debt and took the \$1,066, in lieu of the \$2,152, including interest for five years, to which he was justly entitled, did not appear till this year, 1904. But since the original warrant for \$1,656 is now in the archives, the presumption was that he took the smaller sum, — thus recovering his New Hampshire hat from his Massachusetts congregation after five or six years. This presumption becomes fact by an examination of the State archives for 1794. In that year Dr. Langdon renewed his petition for pecuniary justice; stating that he had been compelled to draw the insufficient warrant of 1784, in order to pay the borrowed money. But now, "the justice of Congress" having supplied Massachusetts with a repayment of some war expenses incurred in 1775-76, Dr. Langdon trusts that justice will be done him also from this fund. The legislative committee cut down his claim by an erroneous computation, but still recommended a grant of about \$300; which passed the House this time, but was non-concurred by the Senate. Possibly his friends John Hancock and John Langdon may have made up to him from their riches what the State was too niggardly to pay: — it is even possible that he borrowed the money on which he had paid interest from his former parishioner, John Langdon, or his brother Woodbury in Ports-

mouth. At any rate, Dr. Langdon did pay his own debts like an honest man. But the State never paid him in full; yet in 1784, while this affair was pending in Boston, he issued a new and improved edition of his map of 1761, and dedicated it to Hancock, then Governor of Massachusetts, and Judge Weare, then President of New Hampshire, and to the Councils of the two States. So rare has this improved map become, that I have not yet been able to procure a copy good enough to engrave in my History of New Hampshire, wherein brief mention is made of this honored citizen.

When John Eliot came to put Dr. Langdon in his Biographical Dictionary (1809), he made some amends for his harsh and shallow judgments on a wiser and better man than himself, in the matter of the College Presidency. It still remains for the University to do a like penance by erecting his tomb and providing his biography; toward which this sketch is a slight contribution.

Mr. JAMES F. RHODES, having been called on, spoke as follows:—

I shall say a word about the joint meeting of the American Historical Association and the American Economic Association in New Orleans last December. The Associations had never met in the South before. Washington was considered as a border line between the North and the South, and was supposed to satisfy any demand for a Southern meeting, and the project of going to New Orleans was looked at askance by the men who had most to do with the details of the management of the Historical Association, and the Association was taken there by the advocacy of those who concerned themselves rather with its broad interests. It was owing to the enthusiastic support of Captain Mahan, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Lawrence Lowell that the Council fixed upon the Crescent City. "Now is the time to go South," they said, "and if we go South, let us go to the heart of it." Their advice was wise. The meeting was a decided success.

It was not a success in a large attendance on the appointed meetings, but it was a success in giving those who attended it a lively impression of a picturesque city which will last a lifetime. In the traditions of the Association none will be more

vivid than the recollections of that meeting in New Orleans. It was "the most representative assemblage of the two Associations ever had," was one expert opinion. "The largest attendance" was another; but the meetings for the reading of papers were, with the exception of the first meeting, not well attended. The professors and instructors and the ladies, who came in large numbers, preferred to read the book of New Orleans.

"Who knows most about historic London?" I heard Mr. Choate, our ambassador, ask in a speech at a dinner of the Worshipful Company of Fishmongers. "It is not you gentlemen who on business bent go to the city every day of your lives. No; it is the Yankee schoolmarm whom you may see wandering about with a red book under her arm, questioning the policeman on every corner."

So it was in New Orleans. I must premise that one of the cars on the special train from New York was filled with school-teachers from Lowell. The "Yankee schoolmarm" therefore was there in force, observing, indefatigable in seeing everything that there was to be seen. I can give an account of one of her days, which was the day too of many professors and their wives: Rose at five o'clock; went to the French market to drink coffee and enjoy the animated scene; walked through the picturesque Creole quarter; crossed the Mississippi on a ferry boat to get an idea of the vast river; at eleven went to déjeuner at Madame Begué's. The déjeuner lasted two hours, and was presumably cooked by the Madame and served by her husband and sons. In the afternoon visited one of the curious cemeteries and "did" the American quarter; dined at the Café Antoine and went to the French Opera; reached the hotel at midnight. This was magnificent, but hardly a routine meeting.

The most interesting meeting was one held on the morning of the first day at the Cabildo, a building of the Spaniard. The room in which we met was rectangular in shape, of fine proportions, and in it the sovereignty of Louisiana was transferred from Spain to France and from France to the United States. It was also where President McKinley was received, the only President who has ever visited New Orleans. It is now the room of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, and on the walls are portraits of all or nearly all of the judges

of the Supreme Court since Louisiana has belonged to the United States.

Never, I think, has the Association met in so historical a place, and never have the surroundings seemed so in keeping with the profession of historians. The programme had the proper flavor. The President of the Louisiana Historical Society welcomed the American Historical Association, and the papers were all connected with Louisiana. Mr. Dunning read Professor Sloane's paper on "World Aspects of the Louisiana Purchase." Judge Howe discoursed on "The Civil and the Common Law in the Louisiana Purchase." Dr. McCaleb read of "New Orleans and the Aaron Burr Conspiracy." Mr. Thwaites told in a witty and engaging manner "The Story of Lewis and Clark's Journals," and Dr. Shephard dilated on "Louisiana in the Spanish Archives."

Two judges of the Supreme Court honored the meeting with their presence, and near the close of the session came a commander of a Spanish warship, the *Rio de la Plata*, who came to New Orleans to take part in the great civic celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the transfer of Louisiana to the United States. At the luncheon which was served by the Louisiana Historical Society, the commander displayed the wonderful courtesy and polished manners of his country. One could not help thinking of the war six years ago, nor help fearing that one might inadvertently make some allusion which would hurt the feelings of our visitor; but the urbanity of the Spaniard put every one at his ease, and we talked as if the friendly relations of our nations had never been disturbed. I was glad to introduce to him two members of the Association who talked with him fluently in his own tongue, and I believe there were three or four more men at the luncheon who would have been able to do likewise. The commander asked eagerly whether Captain Mahan were present. He had read his books, in translation of course, and urgently desired to meet him; but unfortunately Captain Mahan was not able to go to New Orleans.

The evening session of the first day is always devoted to the addresses of the two Presidents of the Associations. Mr. Seligman read a thoughtful address, and Mr. Haskins read the excellent paper of Mr. Lea. The reader of the proceedings of the New Orleans meeting will undoubtedly be impressed with



the learning and intelligence of those two papers, but he will miss the pleasure that those present had in hearing the welcoming address of President Alderman of Tulane University. A gentleman of fine presence, he spoke with the fervid eloquence of the Southerner, chastened by the academic manner; and the feeling words that he uttered on the subject of the negro, of which his mind and the minds of his fellow-citizens were full, made an impression not soon to be forgotten.

While most of the men and women who attended the meeting in New Orleans were in the South but a week, it is impossible to be there that brief time without pondering the negro question, which was so interestingly discussed in this Society last autumn.

I remained in New Orleans three days, then spent four days in Thomasville, Georgia, and nineteen days in Florida. Nowhere in the Southern States can so little be learned of the South as in Florida. The average seeker of a good winter climate travels from New York to St. Augustine in a Pullman car on a limited train, and thence proceeds to Palm Beach, where he finds a more genial and wholesome climate than Egypt, a place with surroundings more tropical and one in which cleanliness is supreme. His associates are men from the North; the whole service of the hotel and the provision for amusements are for Northern people. He learns nothing of the South so far as the people are concerned, except what he may get in two newspapers that he reads, "The Florida Times Union," published at Jacksonville, and the "Savannah News," which are excellent and clean newspapers in every respect. In thinking over my impressions, therefore, I find that they are mainly derived from the three days in New Orleans and four days in Thomasville.

President Alderman said in the address to which I have referred:—

"The tragic fundamental fact in Southern life is an economic fact—the presence here in large numbers of the African, is a great economic factor. There has not been a moment in sixty years, largely owing to his presence, that the South has not passionately subscribed to one or two or three great political dogmas or doctrines. . . . For sixty years the South stood ready to die and did die for the doctrine of State sovereignty. To-day it would die with even more amazing oneness of mind

for the doctrine of racial integrity or the separateness of the two races. This does not mean race hatred. . . . The best Southern people not only do not hate the negro, but come nearer to having affection for him than any other people on earth, and they hold this faith in a spirit of common-sense and justice and sympathy and helpfulness to the black race. They are too wise not to realize that posterity will judge them according to the wisdom they use in this great concern. They are too just not to know that there is but one thing to do with a human being, and that thing is to give him a chance, and that it is a solemn duty of the white man to see that the negro gets his chance in everything save social equality and political control."

At Thomasville, in a climate better than the Riviera, among beautiful pine groves and ornamental live oaks and magnolias, a number of my old friends of Cleveland have bought large tracts of land and remodelled the Southern houses or built new ones, and are living there in somewhat the same luxurious style we are accustomed to associate with the Southern planters of the time before the war, although the Northerners have brought comfort and method unknown in the days of slavery. Through them I came in contact with some Southern people, among them one Southern gentleman who produced an abiding impression. He had a Henry Clay face, in which refinement and nervous intelligence were in every feature. He was a reader of books, and we discussed everything as freely as if we had been two Northern men. "What about these lynchings?" I asked. "Were conviction at law more speedy and punishment swift, might they not be avoided?" "No," he replied. "No Southern gentleman will ask a woman to go before a jury and relate the details of her outrage. All that we demand is for the woman to say, 'That is the man.' Remove all the white people of Georgia and people the State with New Englanders: the same conditions would exist, the same punishment for rape would be inflicted. But this crime," he went on to say, "is confined to a low brutish class,—to the outcasts among the negroes. The negroes as a whole are a kind, amiable, faithful people. It is nonsense to talk of their deportation. We need them to raise cotton and corn and for domestic servants. Your Ohio friends bring their white servants: they are better, of course, but we cannot afford them, and besides we must have help the year around. The negro in Georgia is

getting on all right. He is gradually becoming the possessor of property, and he who acquires property is industrious. 'Talk about the negro problem,' said to me a negro tailor who owns land and buildings in Thomasville and is an excellent workman. 'If the negroes would work all day and sleep all night, there would be no negro problem.'"

With my old Cleveland friends I discussed the negro question. All of them were Republicans, and two of them had been Republicans of the stalwart sort with Abolition antecedents. They talked of the negro exactly as did my Southern friend, although perhaps somewhat less sympathetically. I said to one of my hostesses whom years ago I remembered as an uncompromising critic of the South for her attitude towards the lower race, "Why, you always used to say colored people and now you speak of them as niggers." "Yes," she replied, "and I think of them just as the Southern people do."

When one goes on his travels and meets people whose environment is different from his own, it is always a useful inquiry, With whom is he socially most in sympathy? Most of us in Europe take first to the Englishman, next to the German, then to the Frenchman,—and such is my own experience. Bearing this in mind, I have gone over my impressions since 1868, the date of my first visit to the South,—a visit which has been succeeded by a number of others. In matters of politics and present-day problems I feel in greater sympathy with the Southerner than I do with the Englishman. We have the common feeling toward Washington, toward the constitutional fathers, and toward the Constitution itself, and there are also growing up other bonds of sympathy. The Southerners are coming to love Lincoln and Grant, and to have an affectionate regard for McKinley.

On the anniversary of Lee's birthday, a Confederate soldiers' monument was dedicated at Gainesville, Florida, and these were the words of the orator of the day, presumably a Confederate colonel: "That typical American, Abraham Lincoln, could do you justice; the soldier and statesman, McKinley, was great enough to wear the Confederate badge as the guest of the Confederate soldier, and with the courage almost sublime, pay tribute to the living veteran and suggest plans for honoring those who were dead." Still later the orator referred to "the brave and generous Grant."

Mr. JAMES F. HUNNEWELL exhibited a collection of facsimiles of engravings by Peter Pelham, and read the following memorandum:—

*Pelham Club Portraits.*

Near the middle of the seventeenth century engraving in mezzotint became known, and a century later was in England a favorite style shown by many superb works by great masters of the art. At the latter period Peter Pelham, an English engraver, came to Boston. Here he followed an example set by great engravers in London, the production of portraits of men of rank and eminence. He selected a class especially distinguished by position and learning,—the Boston ministers, who were not only the religious teachers of the community, but also the literary class. To these he added a few other subjects, eminent men, and engraved a series of portraits far surpassing any then known in British America and seldom since rivalled. Every one of his works has become rare and costly, some of them extremely so, and a collection of them is now almost beyond possibility.

Fortunately there is now a process by which they can be reproduced in a way that makes a copy hardly distinguishable from an original, and also fortunately there is one of our fellow-citizens, a wise and assiduous collector, who has formed a series remarkable for extent and condition, and who, using this process, has made it possible for others to have and to hold many a portrait practically now unobtainable in the original. By his generosity, and in his name, I present to the Massachusetts Historical Society thirteen large reproductions.

Rev. Dr. Cotton Mather, Old North Church, 1727 (perhaps the first mezzotint produced in America).

Rev. Dr. Benjamin Colman, Brattle Street, 1735.

Rev. Dr. Timothy Cutler, Christ Church, 1750.

Rev. William Hooper, A.M., Trinity Church, 1750.

Rev. Henry Caner, A.M., King's Chapel, 1750.

Rev. Thomas Prince, A.M., Old South, 1750.

Rev. Charles Brockwell, A.M., Royal Chaplain, 1750.

Rev. Mather Byles, A.M., n. d.

Rev. John Moorhead, Presbyterian, 1751.

Governor William Shirley, 1747.

Sir William Pepperrell, Bart., 1747.

Thomas Hollis, merchant of London, 1751.

These are from originals by Pelham ; to them is added

John Adams, second President of the U. S. A., by E. Savage, 1800.

All are marked "The Pelham Club—Boston 1901"—a club probably the most limited in Boston. It has perpetuated many of the almost vanished works of our early art, that are quite as important as some historical pamphlets, so called, and more interesting ; works that show, as well as any could at the time, men who did much to shape thought and history in our Provincial period.

All the credit for collecting and wonderfully reproducing, for good work in our art and history, and for this gift, is due to Frederick Lewis Gay, of Brookline.

Mr. SAMUEL S. SHAW communicated an original letter of Henry Phillips written to his mother after the Woodbridge-Phillips duel, and said :—

The duel in the summer of 1728 between Henry Phillips and Benjamin Woodbridge—an event, I believe, unprecedented in Boston—stirred the little town to its foundations. The letter which I present from the surviving combatant may throw some light on the affair. The story has been well told by Sargent (who had documents in his possession coming from a descendant of Peter Faneuil) in his "Dealings with the Dead." I am not aware that the name of the challenging party has been anywhere stated. According to this letter, it was Woodbridge. The letter also affords an explanation of the singular inhumanity of one Robert Handy, who arrived on the scene of the encounter just after it was over, and finding Woodbridge fainting and begging that a surgeon might be sent to him, turned his back and paid no attention to his request. Sargent attributes this conduct to a fear of being implicated in criminal proceedings. This may well have been the case if that "vile fellow" Handy, mentioned in the letter, is the Robert Handy who testified before the examining magistrate. He there represented himself as anxious to prevent a meeting and as having done what he could to dissuade the young men from fighting: the letter tells a wholly different story, and appeals to the evidence of Mr. Pelham the limner (without doubt the step-father of Copley), that Woodbridge told him that Handy had pressed him for three weeks or a

month to challenge Phillips. The consciousness of having played this part may have made him doubly anxious to wash his hands of the affair, and fears for himself may have outweighed all considerations for a dying man.

I will briefly recall the main facts of the story to your memory. Henry Phillips was the son of the bookseller and publisher Samuel Phillips, whose name figures on so many of Cotton Mather's productions, and who was described by the eccentric Dunton in his "Life and Errors" as "the most beautiful man in town." Young Phillips was twenty-four years of age and a Harvard graduate of 1724. He and his brother Gillam had recently become associated in the book-selling business as successors to their father. Benjamin Woodbridge, according to the epitaph on the conspicuous gravestone near the fence of the Granary Burying Ground, was the son of the Hon. Dudley Woodbridge and in the twentieth year of his age. He is said to have come from a distant abode and to have been taken into partnership by Jonathan Sewall.

The parties met on the evening of July 3, on the Common near the Powder House, and fought with small swords. Phillips ran Woodbridge through the body and was himself slightly wounded. Handy then appeared, and in spite of Phillips's earnest entreaties that he would go for a surgeon to attend to Woodbridge, did nothing, and through Phillips's own exertions a surgeon and a physician went in search of Woodbridge, but, curiously enough, were not able to find him. His dead body was discovered at three in the morning. In the mean time Phillips, by the efficient aid of his brother Gillam and of Gillam's brother-in-law Peter Faneuil and of John Winslow, captain of the pink Molly, was rowed to his Majesty's man-of-war Sheerness, then lying between the Castle and Spectacle Island. His hospitable reception is attributed by Sargent to the natural sympathy of naval officers for a spirited young fellow who has killed his man. The testimonials in his behalf, however, which he refers to in his letter, signed by eighty-three of the most eminent of his townsmen, show him to have been a peaceable and well-disposed young man for whom a general sympathy was felt, and a pardon hoped for on the ground that he was more sinned against than sinning. By morning the Sheerness had sailed,

and Phillips was out of reach of Lieutenant-Governor Dummer's proclamation and the indictment for murder found by the grand jury. He made his way to Rochelle in France, and to the protection of Peter Faneuil's brother Jean. He died there on the 29th day of May, 1729, about two months after the date of this letter. A few days after his decease his mother started on a futile journey to visit him. This letter was found among the papers of his nephew, Samuel Phillips Savage.

ROCHELLE, March 24<sup>th</sup>, 1729.

HONOURED MADAM, — I have the Satisfaction of your letters of the 28<sup>th</sup> October, 25<sup>th</sup> November & 4<sup>th</sup> December, and hope God Almighty of his Infinite mercy will give me grace & Strength to follow the Advice you give me in them. According to your desire I am come into France, but find it as all other places extreamly chargeable, especially to me who have so small a Stock. Whether I am like to get my Pardon, only God knows, so must desire something may be done for me, not to let me Spend the last farthing. I do assure you Madam, I have not had one moments pleasure since I left you, neither do I expect any in this World, without I should be so happy to See my Dear Mother and my Native Country, which I prefer to any I have Seen. The living here is not very agreeable to me & dear, so must renew my former request. I should have wrote you before but was hindered by a violent fever w<sup>ch</sup> God Almighty has pleased to raise me from & to give tolerable Strength, which Sickness has been vastly expensive to me. Am prodigiously surpriz<sup>d</sup> who can have so much ill nature to Stop my letters, for am sure never failed of any opportunity when I could write. Would I be so ungratefull after I have offended so dear a Mother, not please in writing a few lines; I hope I have now a Sense of my Duty to so good a Parent, & bewail that ever I offended you, which intreat your forgiveness: — I am uncertain who I can employ for me in my Unhappy Affair; if it should be desired of M<sup>r</sup> Yeomans fear he would refuse it, having little acquaintance with the family, but will write M<sup>r</sup> Lechmore to try what he can do for me, or whether he should advise me to some other person; Am at a terrible Loss to have no friend in England of Note to Sollicit for me, otherwise I hope I should obtain what I earnestly intreat for, from God & Man. I wrote you p<sup>r</sup> Roby from Holland to get the Affidavit of M<sup>r</sup> Pelham the Limner, who declared to Cap<sup>t</sup> Cornwall & Maj<sup>r</sup> Cosby, M<sup>r</sup> Woodbridge told him Handy prest him for three weeks or a month to challenge me, which he said he would never do, till at last to be Sure over persuaded by that Vile Fellow. I am extreamly obliged to those Gentlemen who are so good natured to Set their hands to a paper of

my good Behaviour, & desire my thanks may be return'd them. Was in great Hope Gov<sup>r</sup> Burnet would have wrote in my favour which you nor my brother (tho' you gave me hopes of it) in a former letter, & hope if he has not, He will be so much my friend. Am very sorry my brother has arrested M<sup>r</sup> Smith, as he writes he has, M<sup>r</sup> Hooper having received fifteen pounds at three payments, as to my other bills don't know whether they will be paid or no, Maj<sup>r</sup> Cosby (Hooper writes me) gives fair words & keeps out of the way. I would beg the favour of my brother Gill to desire M<sup>r</sup> Bant or any of his friends that deal to Holland to employ M<sup>r</sup> Ward Stanton, who is an English Gentleman of fortune and one that bears the best of characters; if you can do him any Service at Boston or New York, shall be very glad for he was extreemly Civil. Must desire you to remitt me money, for if them Bills are not pay'd shan't have a farthing, & to be in a foreign place without it would be terrible. My desire is to write to all my Friends, but the Postage is so vastly chargeable (every letter going thro' Parris) that hope they will excuse. This may Serve to let them see my Circumstances. O how I long to enjoy y<sup>e</sup> Company of my dear Friends, for am Sure have but few abroad, I alwayes keeping very close & making little Acquaintance. M<sup>r</sup> Faneuil received me with Courteousness, and promises to do all for me that lies in his power. Dear Madam Give my Service to my Aunt Paxton & all friends & Love to my Dear brothers & Sisters, and accept your Self the Duty of him who is,

Madam, Your Dutifull Son till Death

HENRY PHILLIPS.

Mr. Shaw also communicated from the papers of his grandfather, Rev. Oakes Shaw, minister of the Church at West Barnstable, a letter from Governor Hutchinson to Rev. Gideon Hawley. Mr. Hawley graduated at Yale College in 1749, began his career as a missionary to the Indians in 1752; and in 1757 was appointed to the Indian Church at Mashpee, where he continued to labor for half a century. Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hawley were friends and neighbors, and both died in the same year. Hutchinson's reference to his letters which were sent to Boston by Dr. Franklin needs no explanation, beyond the identification of the "gentleman of your county" with Colonel James Otis, of Barnstable, then a member of the Council.

Boston, 23 Aug. 1773.

DEAR SIR, — I have received a set of Queries from the celebrated Doctor Robertson of Edinburgh relative to America of which he is about to publish the History. Those which respect the Indians I have copied



& shall inclose to you and shall be glad of as full an answer to each as you are capable of giving and I will give you the credit of them when I send them to him. He has sent the same Queries to M<sup>r</sup> Smith of New York. Your acquaintance with the Iroquois tribes and also with the Indians of New England will give you peculiar advantage. Some of the Queries can be answered only by those writers who were conversant with the Indians before they had received Impressions from the European.

I have seen some of your letters to the Lieut<sup>t</sup> Governor & am obliged to you for the marks of your friendship.

The late malicious attempt to blast my reputation by obtaining private letters in an infamous way and putting a sense upon them which I never intended & the words without torturing will not bear, is so infamous that it must finally bring dishonour upon all concerned in it and upon a Gentleman of your County in particular who has been one of the most forward in promoting some of the Resolves which he must know to be false.

When you see Mr. Williams pray mention me to him as having regard & esteem. I am, S<sup>r</sup>,

Your most obed<sup>t</sup> Serv.

THO. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. Charles C. Smith, in behalf of Rev. Dr. EDMUND F. SLAFTER, who was unavoidably absent, communicated the following paper:—

*The Landing of the Hessians.*

The following letter will, for the most part, explain itself. It bears no date, but was issued probably in some part of July, 1776. The original, of which this is a copy, is in the possession of Miss Mary Long Gilman, of Exeter, New Hampshire. The letter is as follows:—

By Several Authenticated Accounts lately Received, Twelve Thousand or upward of German Troops are on their passage from England said to be bound to Boston, but as the place they are bound to is not Certainly known it is of great Importance that each Colony be prepared to Oppose them. Therefore you are Required Immediately to give orders to all the Captains under your Command to Direct their Several Companies to hold themselves in Readiness to March on the Shortest Notice, and that they Equip themselves in the best manner they can, and you are to take the most unwearied pains to Examine into the State of the Soldiers & in particular see their fire Arms are kept in the utmost Readiness for Action, and in Case of

an Alarm or Certain Notice of the Landing of Troops in the Massachusetts Bay or New Hampshire & Assistance is Required to give orders to your Several Companies to Muster & March as many men as can be possibly Raised out of them, properly Officered with Tried Officers, Captains & Subalterns according to the Number of Men, to the place where said Troops are Landed, to Assist in Repelling them, and you may assure all Such Officers & Soldiers that may March on any Such Alarm that they shall be paid for the time they Continue in the Service the same Wages & Billeting as the other Troops Raised in this Colony for the publick Service, and that they shall not be detained any Longer than the Emergency of Such alarm may Require.

By order of Hon<sup>ble</sup> Committee of Safety for the Colony of New Hampshire.

NATH<sup>l</sup> FOLSOM — M G

To Coll THOMAS STICKNEY.

A few notes in connection with this paper may be of some historical interest.

It will be observed that the order contained in this letter was issued by the authority of the Committee of Safety. Immediately after British rule in the Colony of New Hampshire had been laid aside and abolished, it became necessary to establish a new government in place of the old. Consequently, as a temporary expedient, the whole civil power was invested in a convention consisting of delegates from all the towns in the colony. During the recess of this convention its authority, which was supreme and absolute, was delegated to a committee which was called the Committee of Safety. The foregoing letter of instruction by Major-General Folsom<sup>1</sup> was issued by the authority of this committee.

<sup>1</sup> Nathaniel Folsom, at this time Major-General of all the military forces of New Hampshire, rendered very important service during the whole period of the Revolutionary War. Even in the colonial period, in the expedition to Crown Point on the 8th of September, 1755, as captain of the New Hampshire contingent, he led an attack upon the retreating army of Baron Dieskau, causing great loss to the French, capturing numerous prisoners, with large spoils of stores and ammunition.

He was sent by the first Provincial Congress of New Hampshire to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia in the autumn of 1774. He was chosen Major-General of the forces of New Hampshire in the early part of the summer of 1775. He was a prominent member of the Committee of Safety, and likewise a member of the first Council of the State, which occupied the place of the Senate constituted at a later date. He was born in Exeter, New Hampshire, in 1726, and died there on the 26th of May, 1790. He was an ancestor of Miss Gilman to whom belongs the original manuscript letter presented in these pages. A very full and

Four regiments were organized in New Hampshire to be trained and ready on any sudden emergency, and were officially named "minute men" because they were to be ready at a moment's warning. The foregoing letter was addressed to Colonel Thomas Stickney, and similar letters were doubtless addressed to the colonels of the three other regiments. We do not however know that they are still extant. This may be the only one that has survived the vicissitudes of the last hundred and twenty-five years.

The announcement in this proclamation by the highest military authority in New Hampshire was of a startling character. That twelve thousand or more German troops were already on their passage from England and were to land at some unknown point on the coast of Massachusetts Bay or of New Hampshire was well adapted to create a profound anxiety and alarm. Our people at that time were exceedingly sensitive to any impending danger, especially if it were involved in mystery. The effect of the witchcraft delusion with its horrible consequences had not died away. It had created a habit of sensitiveness which lasted more than a century and a half after the inhuman and satanic inventions for its cure had been laid aside. The stealthy approach of the wily savage in the darkness and in unexpected moments and places in the border towns, stretching through a period of nearly a hundred and fifty years, carrying instant death or brutal captivity to hundreds of brave men, gentle women, and innocent children, was still fresh in the minds of the whole population. The impression which the proclamation of the coming Germans made upon the minds of the people is not a matter of record, but it requires no exuberant imagination to picture the anxiety and fear that prevailed in every village, hamlet, or remote settlement in New England. The unwelcome news spread with marvellous celerity in every direction.<sup>1</sup>

carefully prepared notice of General Folsom may be seen in the "Exeter News-Letter" for November 3, 1899, by Mr. Horace B. Cummings.

<sup>1</sup> There existed at that time in New Hampshire, and probably in all the other New England States, a practical method of expressage, which met all the demands and exigencies of the time. In each town there was a committee whose duty it was to communicate to the adjoining town the latest news relating to the movements of the English army, and they were to communicate it to the next, and so on, and in an incredibly short time every town in the State was informed, and consequently able to take such action as the circumstances required.

In this excited state of the public mind the imagination pictured numberless evils, many of which were little more than hysterical fancies, the offspring nevertheless of well-grounded fear,—

“Trifles, light as air,  
Are to the ” fearful, “confirmations strong  
As proofs of holy writ.”

The causes of this foreboding fear may be briefly summed up in the following particulars:—

*First*, in New England there was at that time little or no knowledge of the people in Germany. They were far away in a sense which to-day we cannot easily comprehend. Inter-course was rare, communication was slow and uncertain. The New Englander knew less of the character and temper of the German than we do to-day of the wild tribes in the heart of Africa.

*Second*, the language of these foreign invaders was not understood by our people, and there could be no free inter-communication either by writing or word of mouth. Inter-course for the most part must be impossible and always hazardous. The danger incident to this want of intercommunication had been brought home to them by bitter experiences with the savages from the first plantation of the colonies.

*Third*, the expected German troops were known to be mercenaries, paid to fight in a cause of which they had no personal knowledge and in which they had no personal interest. In the estimation of the people of New England they differed little from the highwayman who invaded their homes to pilfer and destroy. Their character, so far as it could be learned, placed them beyond the pale of Christian intercourse and civilization.

*Fourth*, it was even reported in some parts of the country that these hirelings, soon to reach our shores, were cannibals and had an appetite for small babies.

*Fifth*, it was believed, on very good evidence, that in battle the Germans would give no quarter, or, in other words, that all prisoners of war taken by them would be immediately put to death.

Such rumors as these, whether fanciful or well grounded, did not fail to produce a profound anxiety and fear.

But this state of the public mind was destined to be of short duration. On the fifteenth day of August, 1776, the German troops, whose arrival had been looked for with so much interest and anxiety, reached Sandy Hook and landed on Staten Island. This first instalment numbered not less than eight thousand, including officers and men. But others followed soon after and from time to time, and the total number hired by England and landed on our shores during our Revolutionary War was *twenty-nine thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven*. They came from six petty German states, but in history are irrespectively denominated Hessians. Of this number *twelve thousand five hundred and fifty-four* never returned to their German homes. This included those who were killed in battle, those who died of disease, those who deserted, and finally those who were discharged at the end of the war but who preferred to remain and make their homes with the people against whom they had been cruelly forced to bear arms. It has been estimated that the deserters numbered not less than *five thousand*.<sup>1</sup>

The rank and file of the Hessians, although forced into the service against their wills, were undoubtedly good soldiers, who performed their duty with exemplary fidelity. The officers probably came willingly, with the hope of rising in command and bettering their fortunes.

In the early stages of the war the Hessian officers, proud of their profession and accustomed to the superior equipment of a standing army, looked upon our plainly clad colonial officers with a supercilious contempt, and often applied to them opprobrious epithets. A mutual dislike was the natural and inevitable result. This, however, subsided in some degree as years went on.

An incident illustrates the aversion or even hatred entertained in New England for these mercenary intruders. At the period of the Revolution and long afterward, the most important cereal for the table of the rich and poor alike was the product of the New England soil. The wheat-fields of the West were distant, transportation was impracticable, and we were wholly dependent upon the home product. An enemy suddenly appeared to arrest the production of this almost necessary article of food. An insect unknown before in this region,

<sup>1</sup> Vide "The Hessians" by Edward J. Lowell, p. 300.

coming apparently in vast numbers, deposited an ovum in the soft and succulent part of the plant, which soon developed into a voracious pest, and the whole wheat-crop was greatly diminished and at last utterly destroyed. Looking about for a name that should be appropriate and significant, with a keen memory of the past and a touch of patriotic sentiment, they called the unwelcome visitor the *Hessian fly*.

There is abundant reason for knowing that the Hessian officers held out the threat, whether *in terrorem* or otherwise, that no quarter would be given to prisoners of war. When the life of a prisoner was spared, they spoke of it as an act of generosity. In their letters and journals are recorded instances of prisoners falling upon their knees and begging piteously for their lives.

A notable example of this "threat of no quarter" may be seen in the attack on the little fort at Red Bank, in New Jersey, on the Delaware River, a few miles below Philadelphia. Colonel von Donop, one of the most distinguished Hessian officers, with an ample force of mercenaries, was directed to capture this fort. On his arrival he sent an aide de camp to demand its surrender. The demand was couched in the following extraordinary language: "The King of England commands his rebellious subjects to lay down their arms, and they are warned that if they wait until the battle, no quarter will be granted." Colonel Christopher Greene, in command of the garrison, replied that "he accepted the terms and that no quarter would be given on either side." The fort was a temporary structure, but had nevertheless some good qualities. It was equipped with three hundred men and fourteen cannon. The attack was made at "double quick" and with exultant fury, but it was disastrous. Donop was mortally wounded, and his army, possibly impelled by the fear of "no quarter," took to their heels. Donop was taken into the fort and tenderly cared for till he died three days later. Among his last words he said, "It is an early end of a fair career, but I die the victim of my ambition and of the avarice of my sovereign."

It is thus quite clear from the sequel of this conflict that the American commander did not intend to carry out the threat of "no quarter" forced upon him in a moment of excitement and clearly contrary to the rules of civilized warfare.

We cannot indeed believe that the Hessian officer himself would have carried out his threat if the opportunity had been given him. There is no instance on record, so far as we know, in the War of the Revolution, in which this savage and barbarous policy was publicly announced, much less carried into practice. If any officer of either army indulged in this kind of threatening proclamation, he doubtless regarded it as intended to produce a restraining fear, which might save human life and avoid human suffering.

The information contained in these notes has been obtained mostly from the work of Mr. Edward Jackson Lowell, a lately deceased member of this Society, called all too soon from his earthly labors. Gladly would the members of this Society and all others who appreciate good historical work have breathed the prayer of the old Latin poet, —

“*Serus in cœlum redeas, diuque  
Lætus intersis populo.*”

In closing these notes, I cannot refrain from adding a few words on Mr. Lowell's monograph entitled “The Hessians and the other German Auxiliaries of Great Britain in the Revolutionary War.”

It was not possible before the publication of this volume to obtain from our general histories a clear and definite idea of the part taken by the Hessians, or the value and importance of their service to the British arms. A need had existed from the beginning. Mr. Lowell supplies this need with great fullness, accuracy, and detail. The sources of information consulted by him were numerous, various, and of the highest credibility. The bargaining for the troops with the German princes is adequately, fully, and clearly set forth. By them the sacred precincts of the family were invaded, and thousands of young men were forced at the point of the bayonet, amid the tears of fathers and mothers, into a service which promised them nothing but hardship, suffering, and death. The infamy and disgrace of these bargainings in the sole interest of avarice and of unauthorized power will cling forever to the memory of these sordid princes, who in the moral estimation of good men can be placed but little above the Roman Emperor who had the malicious hardihood to assassinate his mother.

The English were *particeps criminis* in these unsavory transactions. The blood-stains on George III. and his ministers will not fade away while it is the office and duty of the historian to search out and record the truth. Such brutal conduct at the present day would shock the moral sense of the civilized world.

Mr. Lowell's style is characterized by simplicity, clearness, and vivacity. It is eminently suited to the subject of which he treats. The narrative moves on in a natural and unpretentious way, and from the beginning to the end is constantly gathering up new elements of interest and importance. The student, with even a moderate degree of historical instinct, may well be excused if, for the moment, he sometimes imagines that he is reading an entertaining and absorbing romance. In all respects this volume is a needed and valuable contribution to the history of our War of Independence.

A new volume of the Proceedings — Volume XVII. of the second series — was ready for delivery at this meeting.

Since the foregoing record was put in type our associate Mr. Josiah Phillips Quincy has made a careful examination of the papers given by Miss M. P. Quincy, and has prepared the following list, which is here printed for convenience of reference: —

*Contents of Chest presented by Miss Mary Perkins Quincy to the  
Massachusetts Historical Society.*

1. History of the Quincy family, by Professor Edward E. Salisbury. This gives both the male and female descendants of the family, and contains an exhaustive index.
2. Pedigree charts, with coats-of-arms, made by Professor Salisbury.
3. A little journey to Thorpe-Achurch, by Mary Perkins Quincy, illustrated by photographs. Also notices of Lilford cum Wigsthorpe.
4. A water-color painting of a castle owned and occupied by Lord Roger De Quincey, Earl of Ashby, in the year 1207.
5. A paper read by Miss Mary Perkins Quincy before the Colonial Dames of America. Its subject was the two Dorothy Quincys.
6. Memoranda respecting Saher de Quincy, the Magna Charta Baron; also of Roger de Quincy, second Earl of Winchester, and of his daughters.



7. An article by Joseph Bain, F. S. A. Scot., with details of the Earls of Winchester.

8. Correspondence of G. F. Tudor Sherwood, Esq., for Professor Salisbury and Miss Mary Perkins Quincy. This refers to researches in England connected with the Quincy family.

9. Notes about the Quincy family, derived from the Roger de Quinceys of Chislehurst, England, 1897.

10. Miscellaneous correspondence connected with researches in Europe.

11. A paper by Miss Mary Perkins Quincy on the first Edmund Quincy in America, and of the Quincy name across the sea.

12. The Quincys of to-day who bear the surname in New England.

13. The Quincy name found in antiquarian annals and genealogies.

14. Researches among data and memoranda of the Quincy name at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

15. Ordnance Maps of Northamptonshire, Rutland, and Huntingdonshire.

16. The Quincy coat-of-arms.

17. Early Quincy researches at the Heralds' Office in London, by "Portcullis."

18. Early Quincy data and memoranda from the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the British Museum, London.